Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-128
Thursday
6 July 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-128 6 July 1989

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

General Comments on Troop Withdrawal From CSSR *[Prague RUDE PRAVO 1 Jul]* 1
Progress Noted Since Nuclear Test Treaty *[TASS]* 3

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Professor Urges 'Radical Changes' in CEMA *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Jun]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

North Atlantic Assembly Group Visits USSR 6
Meets With CEMA Secretary 3 Jul *[TASS]* 6
Visits Supreme Soviet Chairmen 4 Jul *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 6
Meets With Yazov 5 Jul *[TASS]* 7
International Conference Held on Nuclear Plants *[TASS]* 7
International Economic Conference in Brussels Ends *[Moscow Radio]* 7
Journalists' Work Hampered at UN Forum in USSR *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]* 8
USSR Officials Return From Socialist International *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 8

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Adm Crowe Cited on Impressions of USSR Visit *[TASS]* 9
Results of Crowe, Akhromeyev Visits Discussed *[Charikov, Grachev on Moscow Radio]* 9
Supreme Court Decision on American Flag Viewed *[TASS]* 9
U.S.-USSR Central America Consultations Held *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 10
Rogachev, U.S. Officials Discuss Cambodia *[TASS]* 10
U.S. Decision on Indian Ocean Cuts Noted *[IZVESTIYA 30 Jun]* 10
U.S. 'Conjuring Trick' on SDI Allocations *[Korshunov on Moscow Radio]* 10

China

CPC's Jiang Zemin Hits Bourgeois Liberalization *[PRAVDA 3 Jul]* 11
PRC Official Cited on Future of Hong Kong, Macao *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 11
Taiwan's Support of 'Mutiny' Called 'Regrettable' *[TASS]* 12

Northeast Asia

Reportage on CPSU Delegation Visit to DPRK 12
DPRK President Receives Delegation *[TASS]* 12
Nikonov Activities Detailed *[TASS]* 13
Nikonov Attends Youth Festival *[TASS]* 14
Nikonov Visits Soviet Club *[TASS]* 14
Nikonov Ends Visit, Departs *[TASS]* 14

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnamese Defense Minister Wraps Up Visit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Jun]* 14
Meets Yakovlev, Yazov, Moiseyev *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Jun]* 14
Recalls WWII Role *[Moscow International]* 15
Departs 26 Jun *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jun]* 15
Arts Cooperation Plan Signed With Vietnam *[VNA]* 15

Near East & South Asia

Air Defense Chief Tretyak Visits Algeria 16
Seen Off to Algeria *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jun]* 16
Greeted by Algerian Officials *[TASS]* 16
Meets With Algerian Defense Official *[TASS]* 16
Leaves Algeria for Home *[TASS]* 16
Prime Minister Gandhi To Visit USSR in Jul *[TASS]* 16
USSR POW Group Meets Bhutto in Pakistan *[TASS]* 16
U.S. Arms Aid to Pakistan 'Defies All Logic' *[Demichev on Moscow International]* 17
Egyptian Industry Minister Concludes USSR Visit *[TASS]* 18
Israeli Acceptance of 'New PLO Policy' Urged *[Moscow Radio Peace and Progress]* 18

Sub-Saharan Africa

Bovin Comments on Prospects for Peace in Angola *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 18
CPSU Greets South Africa Communist Party Head *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 20
Calls on Congress To Stop Apartheid *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 20

East Europe

TASS Cites MTI on Janos Kadar Death 20
Navy Commander Chernavin Departs for Poland *[TASS]* 20
Military Plane Collides With Polish Glider *[TASS]* 20
Lithuania's Brazauskas Leads Delegation to Poland 21
Vilnius on Visit, Treaty *[Vilnius International]* 21
Lithuanian-Polish Program Signed *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 21
Brazauskas Meets Jaruzelski *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 21

West Europe

USSR Envoy Apologizes To Belgium Over MiG Crash *[TASS]* 22
Gremitskikh on Delayed Notification *[Mainz TV]* 22
Shaposhnikov Comments on Incident *[IZVESTIYA 6 Jul]* 22
Further Reportage on Gorbachev's Visit to France 23
Gorbachev, Mitterrand Speeches 4 Jul *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 23
Gorbachev Address at Sorbonne *[PRAVDA 6 Jul]* 27
Gorbachev Remarks on Beijing Events *[AFP]* 31
Gorbachev Talks With French Intelligentsia *[TASS]* 31
Mitterrand Opens Joint News Conference *[TASS]* 32
Gorbachev, Mitterrand News Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Gorbachev-Mitterrand Statement on Lebanon *[PRAVDA 6 Jul]* 39
Gorbachev, Rocard Hold Talks *[PRAVDA 6 Jul]* 39
Gorbachev Lays Wreath at War Memorial *[Moscow TV]* 40
Gorbachev Visits Paris City Hall *[Moscow TV]* 41
Gorbachev, Chirac Meet Briefly *[TASS]* 41
Gorbachev, Georges Marchais Confer *[TASS]* 42
Gorbachev, Mitterrand Hold Talks 6 Jul *[TASS]* 42
Departure Ceremony Held at Orly *[TASS]* 42
Shevardnadze Cited on Results of Visit, Talks *[PRAVDA 6 Jul]* 42
Shevardnadze Calls Visit 'Milestone' *[TASS]* 43
Shevardnadze, Dumas Discuss Trade *[TASS]* 43
Ministers Sign Series of Accords *[TASS]* 43
Soviet-French Agreements Detailed *[TASS]* 43
Yakovlev Meets With Giscard d'Estaing in Paris *[TASS]* 44

Latin America & Caribbean

20 Soviet Fisherman Injured in Lima Bus Bombing *[TASS]* 44
Nicaraguan Air Commander Arrives on Visit 27 Jun *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]* 44

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Meets 6 Jul; Ministers Appointed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 45
Yazov Approved After Deputies' Questions *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Jul]* ... 45
Further Ministerial Appointments Reported *[TASS]* ... 47
Supreme Soviet Hears Report on Fighter Crash *[TASS]* ... 47
Leaders Attend Mourning Watch for Gromyko *[Moscow Radio]* ... 48
Gromyko Funeral, Burial Place Described *[TASS]* ... 48
Supreme Soviet Reviews Candidates 28 Jun ... 48
Voronin Fields Questions *[Moscow Radio]* ... 48
Wins Appointment; Maslyukov Considered *[Moscow Radio]* ... 49
Maslyukov Responds to Questions *[Moscow Radio]* ... 49
Discusses Schools, Water Resources *[Moscow Radio]* ... 50
Gives Views on Agriculture, Defense *[Moscow Radio]* ... 50
Maslyukov Elected *[Moscow Radio]* ... 51
Abalkin Questioned *[Moscow Radio]* ... 51
Abalkin, Belousov Endorsed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 52
Supreme Soviet Resumes Review 29 Jun ... 54
Biryukova Queried as Candidate *[Moscow Radio]* ... 54
Questioning Continues *[Moscow Radio]* ... 54
Deputies Voice Support *[Moscow Radio]* ... 55
Gusev Nominated as Deputy Premier *[Moscow Radio]* ... 55
Election Approved *[Moscow Radio]* ... 56
Supreme Soviet Session 30 Jun Detailed ... 56
Doguzhiyev, Shevardnadze Confirmed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 56
Kamentsev, Gubarev, Filshin Speak ... 57
Kamentsev Appointment Approved *[Moscow Radio]* ... 57
Laverov Confirmed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 58
Sizenko To Join RSFSR Council of Ministers *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Jun]* ... 59
Ukraine Komsomol First Secretary Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* ... 59
State Regulation of Democratization Process Urged *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* ... 61
Medvedev Addresses Academy Graduates 23 Jun *[Moscow TV]* ... 63
Speaks on Restructuring *[TASS]* ... 63
PRAVDA Reports Address *[25 Jul]* ... 64
Regulations for Entry, Exit Eased *[Moscow International]* ... 66
1988 Figures on Soviet Foreign Travel Published *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 19]* ... 67
Gagauz Autonomy Activists Lobby Deputies *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 7 Jun]* ... 67
Pro-Armenia Congress Remarks on NKAO Assailed *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 3 Jun]* ... 68
Baku Paper Hits NKAO Delegate Speech *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 7 Jun]* ... 68
Peace March Begins in Estonia 24 Jun *[TASS]* ... 70
Interethnic Tension in Estonia Noted *[Moscow International]* ... 70
'Top Priority' Program Views Nationalities Issue *[Moscow International]* ... 70
Nationality Issue in Lithuania Discussed *[Vilnius International]* ... 72
Conference Seeks 'Justice' for Soviet Germans *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* ... 74
Ambassador Shikin Views Restructuring at Home *[Vienna KURIER 23 Jun]* ... 74
Georgian Radio Begins Greek Broadcasts *[TASS]* ... 74
Soviet Writers To Publish 'The Gulag Archipelago' *[AFP]* ... 74
New Book on History of Orthodox Church Reviewed *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* ... 75
Local Paper Foretold Bashkir Pipeline Explosion *[TRUD 16 Jun]* ... 76
Latvian Official on Riga Fire Investigation *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* ... 77
Yakovlev Addresses Workers on Restructuring *[Moscow TV]* ... 77
Technical Norms To Be Adjusted to German Norms
[Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 23 Jun] ... 78
6th Edition of Party Journal Outlined *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* ... 78

Economic

USSR Foreign Economic Program Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]* ... 79

Scientific

'Cosmos-2029' Satellite Launched 5 Jul *[TASS]* ... 81

Military

Yazov Speaks to Military Academy Graduates *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Jul]* 82
Moiseyev Addresses General Staff Academy Graduates *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jun]* 84
Akhromeyev Interviewed on New Job as Adviser *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Jul]* 84
Defense Ministry to Publish Draft Regulations *[TASS]* 86
DOSAAF Head on Restructuring With Defense Cuts *[TASS]* 87
Continued Reportage on Nuclear Submarine Accident 87
Further on Sub's Return to Base 87
Causes of Accident Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 87
Investigation Begins *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Jul]* 89
Investigation Completed *[Moscow TV]* 89
Officer Describes 1972 Submarine Disaster *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 90

General Comments on Troop Withdrawal From CSSR

AU0407101789 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 1 Jul 89 pp 1, 7

[Interview with Colonel General Eduard Vorobyev, commander of the Central Group of Soviet Forces stationed in Czechoslovakia, by RUDE PRAVO chief editor Zdenek Horeni: "We Are Implementing the Defensive Doctrine Together"; date and place of interview not given; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Excerpt] Prague—Colonel General Eduard Vorobyev, commander of the Central Group of Soviet Forces stationed in Czechoslovakia, has answered questions asked by RUDE PRAVO chief editor Zdenek Horeni. The text:

[Horeni] The realization of the plan for the unilateral withdrawal of some Soviet units from the CSSR and the GDR has begun. Can you tell us in detail how the withdrawal of the units under your command will continue?

[Vorobyev] The departure of the Soviet military units from the CSSR (determined in accordance with the plan for unilateral withdrawal) is to be concluded by 1 January 1991. There are a number of reasons for the fairly long deadline. First, one has to take into consideration the potential of the Czechoslovak railroad network. We will have to work out a schedule for the movement of military trains which would not obstruct normal transportation in the CSSR. Second, we will also have to take into consideration our possibilities regarding the stationing of military contingents, military hardware, and especially troops on USSR territory. The process of disbanding the units also requires a lot of time. We have taken more than 1,000 soldiers and officers, almost 200 tanks, and 20 combat planes out of the CSSR. The process of reducing the numerical strength of troops, armaments, and combat technology pertains, above all, to airborne combat units and airborne transportation units, and to other offensive units.

[Horeni] Can it be assumed that Czechoslovak journalists will again be present at the withdrawal of some additional Soviet units from Czechoslovak territory?

[Vorobyev] Media representatives from many European countries were present at the departure of the tank units at the end of May. This practice will continue in the future. I have already been asked why media representatives have not been invited to the departure of airborne combat and automobile units. This was not intentional. No one has asked the command of the Central Group of Soviet Forces [for an invitation]; it is as simple as that. We make no sensation of it. For a group of forces this is a run-of-the-mill job connected with the fulfillment of a Defense Ministry order, which concerns the concrete implementation of the Soviet Government's resolution on a unilateral withdrawal of a part of the troops.

The fewer the number of unauthorized persons who distract members of the departing units from their main work, the better organized that work will be. The most important thing is to implement an entire complex of measures connected with the departure without infringing security measures and without galling Czechoslovak citizens with some negative occurrence. The departure of our units, of our people from fraternal Czechoslovakia does not mean the end to their friendship with members of the Czechoslovak People's Army and the civilian population. We greatly value this friendship.

All issues concerning the presence of foreign journalists at the departure of military trains must be dealt with by the CSSR Ministry of National Defense.

[Horeni] Many of our citizens think that the stationing of the Soviet units in Czechoslovakia is funded from our state budget. What is the real situation?

[Vorobyev] This is a naive, mistaken notion. The reality is different. Let us take a glance at official documents. Article 3, section 1 of the USSR-CSSR Government Agreement on Conditions For the Temporary Stationing of Soviet Troops on CSSR Territory states: "The Soviet side assumes costs connected with financing the stationing of Soviet troops on the CSSR's territory."

That agreement stipulates that the CSSR will deliver goods to Soviet trade organizations at state retail prices. The Soviet side pays for both those goods and services in CSSR currency.

The agreement stipulates that, should Czechoslovakia or an individual or an enterprise incur any loss arising from the activity of Soviet troops, the Soviet side will provide full reimbursement in Czechoslovak currency.

[Horeni] Soviet shorter-range nuclear missiles were taken from the CSSR's territory last March. What has happened with them in the meantime?

[Vorobyev] Some of the shorter-range missiles have already been scrapped. It will still take some time before the remaining missiles are be scrapped. Their nuclear payloads will be handed over for use by the Soviet nuclear power engineering sector. Automobiles, towing vehicles, and other dual-purpose military hardware were handed over to the Soviet national economy. The trucks for transporting the missiles were handed over to the enterprises dismantling individual combat equipment. The mobile parts of those vehicles will be used to make cranes. I would like to stress that the scrapping of the shorter-range missiles is proceeding strictly in accordance with schedule. Observers have no comments and note the high level of professionalism of the members of our Army who are involved in that action.

[Horeni] Together with our Army, the Soviet units stationed in Czechoslovakia are ensuring the collective security of the Warsaw Pact countries and are helping to

strengthen the CSSR's defense-capability. How do you assess the standard of the combat cooperation between the Soviet and Czechoslovak units?

[Vorobyev] To begin with, I would like to say that the decisions of the Political Consultative Committee and the united Warsaw Pact's military doctrine, which has a strictly defensive character, are obligatory for all of us. This means that our armies will never be the first to start combat actions or use nuclear weapons. We have a common view on how combat and political preparation is to be organized, a defensive battle waged, and party and political work—tested in practice—carried out.

In order to achieve coordinated activity by commanders, political bodies, and staffs, we hold regular command-staff excercises and military excercises. The achieved results permit one to state quite responsibly that the standard of combat cooperation between the units of the Central Group of Forces and the Czechoslovak People's Army corresponds to the exacting demands of contemporary fighting.

The regular reciprocal visits by military units, jointly organized party-political and sports events, trips in Czechoslovakia, and the friendship between individual families, all draw us together as human beings, allow us to have common interests, and help us to implement the task of educating the Soviet people in the spirit of socialist internationalism.

[Horeni] The Czechoslovak foreign-political initiative aimed at establishing the zone of trust, cooperation, and good-neighborly relations along the line of contact between the Warsaw Pact and NATO was published a year ago. It also presupposes "diluting" that zone. How do you, personally, assess the chances of that initiative?

[Vorobyev] In world politics this initiative is known as the "Jakes' Plan." It also fully expresses our plans regarding the development of good-neighborly relations between the countries of the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

I hope that the "Jakes' Plan" as a component of new political thinking will elicit reciprocal measures from Western European governments. In that respect we have been noting positive processes in the speeches of various political representatives. Now, it seems, it is the turn of concrete steps.

[Horeni] The unilateral steps now proposed by the Warsaw Pact countries are certainly a welcome example in international politics. Is it not time for the NATO countries to also make a similar gesture?

[Vorobyev] One has to say that the USSR approved and is carrying out the decision on a unilateral reduction of troops and armaments, not as a propaganda move, but as a consistent implementation of the policy of relaxation and reduction of the levels of confrontation and a practical realization of the new thinking, without any claims for reciprocal measures on NATO's behalf. At the same time, we would very much wish the NATO countries to respond to our steps with similar actions.

The answer does not depend on us, but on the NATO countries. However, in the highest U.S. circles there is still no unanimity regarding the solution of problems connected with the relaxation of international tension. For example, Henry Kissinger and Zbygniew Brzezinski have been saying that the United States can withdraw up to 100,000 of its troops from the Western European countries, whereas Sam Nunn, chairman of the U.S. Senate's Armed Services Committee, demands that the U.S. troops be beefed up and that several tens of thousands of troops be transferred to Western Europe. In an interview with CNN, Richard Cheney, U.S. secretary of defense, is against the withdrawal of troops, but also does not support Nunn's views openly.

As we can see, views differ considerably. Currently at the center of attention are U.S. President George Bush's proposals, which consist of four points:

First: Determining certain limits on ground armament for NATO and the Warsaw Pact; setting the number of tanks to 20,000 for each side, armored personnel carriers to 28,000 for each side, and 16,500-24,000 artillery pieces, according to caliber, for each side. The armament units withdrawn are to be scrapped.

Second: For the first time the West proposes that the concept for reducing conventional weapons be extended to include combat planes and helicopters stationed on the ground in the area from the Atlantic to the Urals. Each side should reduce them to a level 15-percent lower than NATO's current level. All reduced units are to be destroyed.

Third: The United States will reduce the numerical strength of its troops stationed in Western Europe by 20 percent and, at the same time, the ceiling of the U.S. and USSR ground and air forces stationed outside the national territory in the area from the Atlantic to the Urals will be set at approximately 275,000 on each side. Members of the disbanded units are to be demobilized.

Fourth: The two sides are to set earlier deadlines for the conclusion of an agreement on the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces. The agreement is to be reached within 6-12 months, and the reduction is to be accomplished by 1992 or 1993.

These are, in a concise form, the American proposals which were submitted on the occasion of NATO's anniversary. It goes without saying that they will be thoroughly studied. We can say only one thing now: The first reaction of the world public was not unequivocal. Many political commentators have welcomed the trend toward the reduction of conventional armaments as such, but

immediately noted the repeated theme in the first three points: The USSR and its allies should reduce much more than NATO. [passage omitted]

Progress Noted Since Nuclear Test Treaty

LD0307102789 Moscow TASS in English 1009 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS—The ratification of the Soviet-American treaty on curtailing underground nuclear tests, the 15th anniversary of which is marked today, may become the starting point in the travel toward complete and universal ban on nuclear tests, Soviet Foreign Ministry expert Yuriy Alekseyev told TASS.

Back in 1974, he said, the ratification of the treaty was impeded by differences on the issue of verification. However, the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, that was in force from August 1985 to January of 1987, as well as the full-scale stage-by-stage Soviet-American talks, begun in Geneva in November of 1987, on the limitation and later discontinuation of nuclear tests made it possible to break out of the deadlock. By this time, the parties have advanced substantially toward agreement on the verification protocol to the treaty. Within the context of search for optimal means of verifying the implementation of the 1988 agreement a joint verification experiment, unique from the point of view of mutual trust and openness, was conducted by the two countries.

The current item on the agenda of the fourth round of the full-scale negotiations is the problem of accomplishing agreement on the verification protocol. The Soviet Union proceeds from the fact, Yuriy Alekseyev said, that the ratification of the 1974 treaty may set the beginning to the process of complete banning of nuclear tests by means of a step-by-step limitation of the number and capacity of underground nuclear tests. The work to complete the verification protocol may result in creating a package of mutually acceptable control measures which can be later employed to verify the fulfillment of a global agreement. In order to facilitate the attainment of a complete ban on nuclear testing, the Soviet Union is prepared to immediately renew its moratorium on underground nuclear explosions if the United States reciprocates.

Parallel to the bilateral efforts, the Soviet expert said, the Soviet Union favors a prompt beginning of subject talks on the problem on a multilateral basis, in particular within the framework of the Geneva disarmament conference. The total ban on nuclear tests is a most effective measure which is able to put an end to the nuclear arms race and discontinue the upgrading of this mass annihilation weapon, Yuriy Alekseyev stressed.

Professor Urges 'Radical Changes' in CEMA

PM0307161189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with Professor P. Marinov of Bulgaria's Karl Marx Higher School of Economics, by I. Nekrasov: "Correcting Course. CEMA on the Road to a New Model of Cooperation"; date and place of interview not given; first paragraph is an editorial introduction]

[Text] "We should not engage in cosmetic cooperation between socialist countries now. We need radical changes in CEMA's activity"—our conversation with Professor P. Marinov of the Karl Marx Higher School of Economics (Bulgaria), began with these words.

[Nekrasov] Your thesis requires substantial commentary. In the opinion of a specialist who has spent a long time dealing with the problems of cooperation, what has brought about the reforms in CEMA's activity?

[Marinov] In the past, to be blunt, we made no endeavor to display the difficulties and reveal the contradictions among the countries of the community. In time problems accumulated, brought about by changes in the internal and external conditions of our countries' development and also by a whole series of negative phenomena that accumulated in foreign economic relations. In short, CEMA's 40-year plus activity constitutes not only a chronicle of its undeniable achievements but also to a certain extent the history of unrealized opportunities for cooperation. It is well known that we have lagged behind progressive Western countries in assimilating modern equipment and technologies and that we do not participate effectively enough in the international division of labor. Thus CEMA accounts for only 9 percent of world commodity turnover. Raw materials and fuel comprise a considerable proportion of exports. This situation could not fail to prompt caution. Understanding has increased, and CEMA countries' representatives have said and are saying that the current mechanism for cooperation has in effect become obsolete.

[Nekrasov] What proposals have been put forward to restructure the mechanism for socialist economic integration?

[Marinov] There are many viewpoints on this subject, often with diametrically opposing substance. But the truth always arises from joint efforts. I will say that the countries are unanimous in thinking that the restructuring of cooperation should ensure its intensification, effectiveness, and mutual advantage. These reforms require the broad application of economic levers and a switch from primarily foreign trade ties to the deepening of science and production specialization and cooperation. One must not forget that CEMA is a unique international organization, which above all establishes through its practical activity new-style relations on principles of socialist internationalism. Yet the CEMA countries are by no means heterogeneous in terms of the level of their economic development. Substantial differences in the individual countries' national economies lead quite logically to each of them having their own view of ways to improve their national economy. The restructuring of the foreign economic sphere is no exception either.

It was noted at the recent 131st sitting of the CEMA Executive Committee that work to restructure the mechanism for multilateral cooperation is taking place slowly. One of the main difficulties is to do with the different rates and substance of the reforms in the various CEMA countries and also with their different understanding and approaches to restructuring cooperation. The following question invariably arises: What is to be done next, how are we to reveal more fully the potential of each CEMA country? How are we to combine such different levels of development and specific national economic features to resolve the common tasks of socialist cooperation?

It is not partial but comprehensive and integral restructuring of the mechanism of multilateral cooperation that is needed, along with a switch to a new technological model for integration.

This presupposes the coordination of economic policy between CEMA countries and the coordination of economic plans. We must clearly delineate the object of coordination at various management levels—interstate, sectoral, and enterprise level.

The restructuring of commodity-money relations is of key significance. Life itself today demands that the system of price formation be improved and the gap between contract prices and the world price level closed. With this in view the introduction of contract prices which take the partners' specific interests into consideration is also envisaged. The actual method of price formation must be improved. The reform of credit relations is a key problem.

[Nekrasov] The question of creating a united socialist market has stimulated lively debate. Is it feasible today to formulate this task and resolve it in the near future?

[Marinov] I will not hide the fact that the formation of such a market will not take place today or tomorrow. We need guarantees and sound and objective preconditions to ensure that the necessary points do not just remain "recorded" in the resolutions and decisions adopted at sittings. As long as there are shortages and imbalance in the national economies it will be very hard to resolve this kind of task. We must first increase production of high-quality goods, strengthen commodity-money relations, and develop an internal market. However, we must at the same time work on forming "bricks" of a kind, the simplest elements in the community market. Even if they turn out to be such forms of cooperation as wholesale trade in means of production at markets, or border trade, or else sector markets for individual kinds of goods (for instance, why not start with a market for

the production and sale of computers?). The development and deepening of bilateral contacts and the introduction of individual elements of a single market seem equally fruitful.

[Nekrasov] But everything you have said relates to the extremely far-off future. At the same time one can also hear increasingly frequently the voices of skeptics casting doubt on CEMA's very existence....

[Marinov] People in the West have been saying this since CEMA arose. In short, such "voices" have been notorious for more than 40 years. If we try to somehow describe all the "options" put forward by these skeptics, you would not notice any particular diversity. The proposal most often consists in uniting the countries of Eastern Europe into an international organization where there would be no room for...the Soviet Union. Or, according to other plans, the USSR is given the role of raw material source and market for selling output. Thus, in an interview published in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, while justly stressing the significance of cooperation between economic echelons, Hungarian Professor K. Pecsi proposed replacing CEMA with some integration grouping similar to the OECD (it comprises 23 developed countries from the capitalist world). The professor also believes that there will be no room for the Soviet Union in the new organization for East European countries since, he points out, such a strong economic power cannot be an integration partner: He says that the USSR could be assigned a "patronage role" in the political sphere.

I do not want to weary the reader with figures, but I will mention some data all the same: The USSR does not just provide its CEMA partners with raw materials, power, and semimanufactures, and serve as a stable market where approximately 60 percent of their foreign trade turnover is effected. It is the Soviet Union that is a reliable partner in production sharing and specialization and a consistent advocate of solving the difficult problems of cooperation in the spirit of equality and mutual advantage.

In my opinion, one of the main "secrets" in the entire restructuring of the CEMA mechanism is the meaningful word which is now on everyone's lips—democratization—and which releases really substantial forces.

While transforming the enterprise into the main "protagonist" of cooperation, the role of integration at a large-scale level must not be belittled. All the vitally important problems of the community cannot be solved without interstate agreement, without elaborating a strategy for cooperation, without coordinating national economic plans, and without creating the requisite uniform economic, organizational, and legal conditions in the countries for the development of direct ties and the functioning of joint enterprises and organizations.

The need to agree and coordinate policy not only arises from the internal requirements of cooperation but is also dictated by external reasons. I am referring to the more concerted and coordinated policy being implemented by Western countries, above all the "Common Market" countries, with regard to socialist countries.

In conclusion I would like to stress once again that improving the mechanism of multilateral cooperation and CEMA activity must be implemented above all on an economic basis.

Life has shown that restructuring—both within the countries and also the restructuring of international cooperation and integration—is a great and complex matter which requires constructive solutions rather than wholesale disparagement of everything. We need unusual and fresh ideas. Even if there are only a few of them, let them be related to real life.

North Atlantic Assembly Group Visits USSR

Meets With CEMA Secretary 3 Jul

LD0307205189 Moscow TASS in English 1759 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS—We are prepared for a substantive dialogue with any political and economic organisations of the West, displaying interest in cooperation with the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, CMEA secretary Vyacheslav Sychev said here today, meeting with a North Atlantic Assembly delegation. The delegation is staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Patrick Duffy, president of the North Atlantic Assembly, leads the delegation.

In an interview with a TASS correspondent, the CMEA secretary pointed out that the very visit of a delegation of the North Atlantic Assembly parliamentarians to the Soviet Union was a result of the new political thinking. One could hardly imagine representatives of that organisation visiting the CMEA four years ago. The conversation, during which the parliamentarians familiarized themselves with the council's structure, its activity and improvement of the mechanism for cooperation between its members, revealed the North Atlantic Assembly's poor knowledge of the CMEA. This was confirmed by Patrick Duffy.

Vyacheslav Sychev said that the CMEA's first contact with the North Atlantic Assembly parliamentarians attested to a possibility to develop cooperation between the two organisations. He said such contacts could also contribute to broader business links between the CMEA and the EEC, like, for instance, the four-year contacts with the European Parliament which accelerated the successful completion of the talks between the council and the European Economic Community.

Visits Supreme Soviet Chairmen 4 Jul

PM0507105589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Lively Interest"]

[Text] Members of a North Atlantic Assembly delegation headed by its president P. Duffy showed lively interest in the activity of the Soviet parliament during their visit 4 July to the chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers.

The delegation members showed particular interest in how the Supreme Soviet plans to monitor military appropriations. It was noted in the course of a conversation that before discussing the budget the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions will hear a number of reports and announcements from General Staff and Defense Ministry representatives on Soviet military doctrine and reasonable sufficiency. The committee members will also examine existing or proposed military systems. The viewpoints of all strata of the population and other parliamentary committees and commissions will be taken into consideration here. The committee is tasked with reducing defense spending and converting military production, while at the same time ensuring that these actions do not undermine the country's defense capability. It was stressed that a great deal will depend on the progress of the disarmament talks and other countries' positions on questions of reducing their own arms.

It was noted that Soviet parliamentarians are concerned by two trends. To ensure that the gap that forms as a result of reductions in some definite types of arms is not filled with other types of weapons. Second, neither side must be allowed its own "prohibited" arms as regards reductions.

A luncheon was organized in the delegation's honor on behalf of the chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers.

The Soviet parliament's guests had a conversation at the USSR Academy of Sciences Europe Institute.

The delegation members visited the Lenin Mausoleum. They laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall.

On 4 July N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, met the North Atlantic Assembly delegation headed by its president P. Duffy, which is in Moscow. They had a thorough exchange of opinions on a broad range of questions of mutual interest.

N.I. Ryzhkov familiarized the delegation members—who include parliamentarians from 12 NATO countries—with the in-depth changes in all spheres of the life of society which are taking place in the Soviet Union. The guests' attention was drawn to the results of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the process of forming a new Soviet Government, and the progress of and prospects for radical economic reform. The North Atlantic Assembly delegation members showed keen interest in the processes of renewal under way in the USSR in the political and socioeconomic spheres and the policy of democratization and glasnost.

During a discussion of international problems the sides noted their mutual desire to stabilize the international situation, improve East-West relations, and develop conceptual dialogue aimed at establishing a more stable and secure world.

In response to questions from the meeting's participants, N.I. Ryzhkov described the strategic avenues in the country's socioeconomic development, the foundation for whose formation was laid at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and has continued ever since, including at the recent USSR Congress of People's

Deputies. He also dwelt on a number of specific problems which determine the current state of the Soviet economy and its position in the system of the international division of labor and highlighted the main tasks that must be resolved in order to overcome existing difficulties in the economy, reinforce its social thrust, and involve it more actively in world economic ties. In this context the assembly delegates were given information about the Soviet Union's reduction in defense spending, the conversion of military production, and the channeling of the released capacities and resources into the resolution of social and economic tasks.

The delegation members expressed satisfaction at the meeting and thanks for the frank and constructive nature of the conversation and wished the USSR Government success in its activity aimed at enhancing the well-being of Soviet people and extensively developing peaceful cooperation with other countries.

The following USSR people's deputies took part in the conversation on the Soviet side: A.S. Dzasokhov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee; I.D. Laptev, member of the committee and editor in chief of IZVESTIYA; and V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister.

Meets With Yazov 5 Jul

LD0607100289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1440 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 5 July, (TASS) A meeting was held today between candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Minister of Defense, Dmitriy Yazov and a delegation of the North Atlantic Assembly, led by its chairman Patrick Duffy.

The minister informed his guests about the defensive military doctrine which guides the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries. The minister reported that the destruction of Soviet and U.S. intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is proceeding according to plan. However U.S. plans to commence the modernization of its 'Lance'-type missiles, which may add a new spiral in the arms race, arouses concern.

The Soviet Union, it was said at the meeting, is ready to agree to a prohibition of nuclear weapons tests on a mutual basis with the United States. This would be the first real step towards their complete elimination. Regarding the resumption of talks on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive arms, it was noted that Soviet military experts consider that this is merely the beginning of preparations for the elimination of nuclear weapons as a whole.

Speaking of conventional weapons, the minister notes the illogic position of some Western politicians who assert, on the one hand, that the USSR is "over-armed," and on the other speak of the need to hold talks with our country from a position of strength. It was stressed that the achievement of accords in Vienna is possible only on a mutually acceptable basis. It is necessary to adhere to the balance of interests between the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

The attention of the participants in the meeting was also drawn to the fact that the Soviet Union is against the deployment of weapons in space.

The parliamentarians of the North Atlantic Assembly noted that over the past 40 years, nuclear weapons had made it possible to avert war in Europe, and that there is no need to destroy them entirely. I do not share such a position, said Dmitriy Yazov. The question quite logically arises: If they don't threaten anyone, why have them?

During the meeting, the USSR Minister of Defense replied to questions concerning the organization of the Soviet Armed Forces, the military budget, and other issues.

International Conference Held on Nuclear Plants

LD0107153789 Moscow TASS in English 2149 GMT 30 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—The drafting of a programme on coordination of research aimed at raising safety at nuclear power plants is the main task of an international conference which ended in Moscow today. It was attended by representatives of the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Authority] the CMEA and 16 countries.

Ryszard Buhowecki, a representative of the CMEA Secretariat, said today that questions of forecasting the development of nuclear plants and bringing to minimum the possibility of breakdowns and their consequences are the most urgent in this field. Taking into account concern of the public over the nuclear power industry, it is necessary to work out a scientifically substantiated and single programme for the development of the industry.

First steps have been made in this direction. Now the level of safety at new atomic power stations in CMEA countries is determined not only by specialists of socialist countries but also of the IAEA.

During the conference, its participants examined, apart from methods of preventing incidents at atomic stations, questions of ensuring safety of personnel and drafting methods for determining reliability of equipment at nuclear power plants.

International Economic Conference in Brussels Ends

LD3006210489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 30 Jun 89

[Excerpt] The economic conference Western Europe and Restructuring has ended in Brussels. Our correspondent Leonid Sokolnikov reports from the Belgian capital.

[Sokolnikov] It can be said without exaggeration that never before has so representative a meeting between Soviet economists and West European businessmen, specialists in various areas of trade, production, and banking taken place. The participants' list includes presidents of major companies, those in charge of trade departments, prominent experts in economic relations, publishers of papers and magazines. The Soviet delegation was representative: Academician Aganbegyan, Professor Gavriil Popov, Bukato, chairman of the Bank for Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development, and those in charge of municipal economies and mixed enterprises.

Readiness to cooperate has already been repeatedly demonstrated at meetings of this kind; but this is, perhaps, the first time that assembled in the hall were not only the future business partners, but also people empowered to make decisions or able to influence to a considerable extent the economic policies of our country and the countries of Western Europe alike.

The legal aspects of trade and economic cooperation were actively examined during the conference; experience of work of mixed enterprises was described. These enterprises have grown considerably over the past 12 to 18 months. There are currently in our country approximately 500 various works, concerns, and associations which have joint capital.

The question has arisen of legal protection for investments, of the ways by which the profits are going to be redistributed, and of the opportunities for introducing state-of-the-art technological processes. The time of general promises and ill-defined prospects has now passed. It is now evident that both sides wish to develop their economic relations upon a fundamentally new basis. The specific areas of cooperation which have been proposed and, this is the main thing, the conditions for implementing this cooperation, bring closer the time of economic changes—better times. [passage omitted]

Journalists' Work Hampered at UN Forum in USSR
PM0507163589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 6

[A. Anichkin article: "Why Were Journalists Invited?"]

[Text] The proposal looked tempting: to report on the UN regional conference on disarmament in Dagomys. The Soviet co-organizer—the Committee for the Defense of Peace—promised to ensure normal working conditions for journalists, meetings with participants, and press conferences. Editorial offices responded generously: PRAVDA, TASS, APN, NOVOYE VREMYA, VEK XX I MIR, Central Television, and IZVESTIYA sent correspondents.

The conference was held within the framework of the UN Worldwide Campaign for Disarmament, whose aim is to provide the public with as much information as possible about disarmament problems. Information can be provided if there is information, and if there is access to it. That is unquestionably so. Only for some reason on the 1st day of the discussions in Dagomys someone (we were not told who) decided not to allow the journalists into the sittings, even the speech by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.P. Karpov. We had to battle to ensure that journalists were given advance texts of the speeches.

For any journalist there is one more important place where the necessary information can be obtained in an informal atmosphere: receptions, dinners, and excursions. But we were not invited to a single one of them. We had to go uninvited. V. Kokashvili, senior official at the Committee for the Defense of Peace, severely rebuked one of us at the very first attempt to talk with a foreign participant at the conference not in English, but in his native German language, which, although one of the most widely spoken languages in Europe, unfortunately is not an official UN language.

The foreign participant was surprised by this unceremonious behavior, but we were even more surprised later when we found out that attempts had been made to create anti-journalist feelings among UN Secretariat officials working at the conference. All this took place right in front of the perplexed conference participants. One of them who sympathized with the correspondents noted: There would be no point in this meeting without you and your reports. If only those who had invited the journalists had taken this into account....

USSR Officials Return From Socialist International
PM2706161189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Return Home"]

[Text] On 25 June K.N. Brutents, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, and the department's consultant A.B. Veber returned to Moscow from Stockholm where they had attended the 18th Congress of the Socialist International as CPSU observers.

United States & Canada

Adm Crowe Cited on Impressions of USSR Visit

LD0307100989 Moscow TASS in English 0925 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] New York July 3 TASS—William Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, appeared in the NBC's Meet the Press Sunday programme, sharing impressions of his recent trip to the Soviet Union, and answered journalists' questions.

He said he believes that the demilitarisation process should be continued, that the opportunities that have opened up should be studied, that the process is only a beginning, the first step on a long road, but that a favourable basis has already been laid.

"I think that there's change afoot in the Soviet Union, but that we should move warily and carefully, exploiting opportunities as they present themselves," Crowe said.

At the same time he cautioned that "we should be very deliberate in our own actions, and take steps as the horizon clears, not prematurely".

In answer to the question as to the extent of which, in his view, the risk of an outbreak of military conflict in Europe diminished, Crowe said:

"I don't think that the likelihood of war at this point is very high. As a matter of fact, Marshal Akhromeyev and I both agree that the tension had gone down, that the prospect of war had gone down."

On the other hand, he said, "even the announcments made by Mr Gorbachev recently on their proposed reductions will still leave the Soviet Union with over four million men under arms, the largest establishment in the entire world".

"They still represent a very formidable power. What the leadership has today is very formidable, and could become very threatening.

"But change is everywhere. You can hear it, you can smell it, you can see it."

In a response to a request to comment on the resumed talks in Geneva on nuclear and space arms, Crowe said that those will be "protracted negotiations".

"There is no question that the climate, the environment for talking is improved", Crowe said and voiced hope that the sides would be able to overcome all difficulties.

Results of Crowe, Akhromeyev Visits Discussed

LD0107230989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 1 Jul 89

[From the "International Situation—Questions and Answers" program presented by Yevginiy Tikhonovich Grachev, deputy editor in chief of Moscow Radio main news editorial office, with Aleksandr Nikolayevich Antsiferov, editor in chief of the main editorial office of the network of correspondents and Vladimir Ivanovich Fadeyev and Igor Pavlovich Charikov, foreign policy commentators]

[Text] [Charikov] What are the aims and results of the visits by Marshal Akhromeyev to the United States and by Admiral Crowe to the USSR? The aims are the most noble ones: The results have thus far been generally modest, but promising. What is involved is the establishment of direct contacts between members of the military, who are stating—both ours and the U.S. military—that they also bear responsibility for strengtening political detente. Admiral Crowe said, even before going to the Soviet Union, that he no longer had such a strong enemy sentiment with regard to the Soviet Union. All I can say today is to wish him to share this sentiment with his colleagues in the Pentagon.

[Grachev] I should like to add, comrades, that Admiral Crowe stopped nurturing enemy sentiments with regard to us in double measure when the latest Soviet hardware was demonstrated to him. At any rate, when he looked at our new bombers, he very pensively uttered a most obscure phrase, the rough sense of which was, yes, they've done it!. And his enemy sentiment weakened even more.

[Charikov] I believe nevertheless that one should get rid of enemy sentiments not by building bombers but, on the contrary, by putting these aircraft to other use.

Supreme Court Decision on American Flag Viewed

LD2806205489 Moscow TASS in English 1818 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Washington June 28 TASS—A controversy has been raging in the United States in the recent days over the question of U.S. state symbols and their juridical and constitutional protection. The acuteness of the debate caused by the recent Supreme Court decision about the permissibility of burning the American flag during political protests is shown by the fact that President George Bush deemed it necessary to open his news conference in the White House on June 27 by a statement on this subject.

He said that on Wednesday, 21 June, the Supreme Court issued a decision which held that a person could not be convicted for desecration of the American flag, because to do so would infringe upon the right to political protest. "Now, we've got to be very careful in our society to preserve the right to protest government action", Bush

said. "However, I believe that the flag of the United States should never be the object of desecration. Flag-burning is wrong. Protection of the flag, a unique national symbol, will in no way limit the opportunity nor the breadth of protest available in the exercise of free speech rights", President Bush said.

The President said that because of the importance of this problem there is a need to propose a constitutional amendment to protect the American flag.

The Congress supported the President's stand. The Senate and following it the House of Representatives adopted resolutions in which they expressed their disagreement with the decision of the Supreme Court. Under that decision no laws can prohibit the burning of the American flag during peaceful political demonstrations. That decision was made on the basis of the hearing of the case "Texas versus Johnson". During the 1984 National Convention of the Republican Party of the USA in Dallas, American citizen Gregory Johnson burned the American flag during a demonstration. By the laws of Texas state such an act, if it is "a serious insult to the public opinion", is a crime punishable under law. The court sentenced Johnson to a term of one year in prison and a fine of 2,000 dollars. The Court of Appeal rejected that decision and referred it to the Supreme Court which made the controversial decision. It virtually proclaims unconstitutional the laws of 48 American states on the desecration of the American flag and a similar Federal law adopted in 1968.

Commenting on the Supreme Court decision, the C.B.S. television network noted that in the atmosphere when public opinion polls show virtually unanimous indignation of Americans over the Supreme Court decision, there are hardly any politicians who agree with that decision.

U.S.-USSR Central America Consultations Held

PM3006084189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Consultations Held"]

[Text] In accordance with a prior agreement, Soviet-U.S. consultations on questions concerning the situation in Central America were held in Moscow 20-21 June.

Taking part in the consultations were: on the Soviet side—Deputy Foreign Minister V.G. Komplektov and Yu.I. Pavlov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Latin American Department; on the U.S. side—Assistant Secretary of State B. Aronson.

Rogachev, U.S. Officials Discuss Cambodia

LD2906004289 Moscow TASS in English 2237 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Washington June 29 TASS—By TASS correspondent Alexey Berezhov:

Soviet and U.S. officials held consultations on Asian and Pacific problems here on June 27 and 28.

In a businesslike and frank atmosphere, they discussed relaxation of military tension in the Asia-Pacific region and prospects for bilateral cooperation in settling a number of acute problems facing the region.

The U.S. side welcomed the normalisation of Soviet-Chinese relations as a step leading to stronger peace and stability in Asia and around the world.

Much attention was paid to the situation in Kampuchea in the light of preparations for an international conference on the solution of that regional conflict, and to the situation in the Korean peninsula.

The sides agreed to continue their contacts with the view to promoting success at inter-Khmer talks, forthcoming in July, and broadening dialogue between North and South Korea.

The consultations' participants included:

On the Soviet side—Igor Rogachev, deputy foreign minister; Yuriy Dubinin, ambassador to the United States.

On the American side—Robert Kimmitt, under secretary of state for political affairs; Richard Solomon, assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs; senior executives of the National Security Council and the Department of State.

U.S. Decision on Indian Ocean Cuts Noted

PM3006105789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 1

[From TASS, REUTER, UPI roundup under the rubric "Abroad": "Presence To Be Cut?"]

[Text] On 28 June the U.S. Defense Department announced the U.S. intention to scale down its military presence in the Indian Ocean because of the reduced threat to its interests in this region. At the same time, it stressed that the cuts would not affect the section of the Indian Ocean currently patrolled by the "Ranger" aircraft carrier and 21 U.S. Navy ships, 5 or 6 of which are in the Persian Gulf.

U.S. 'Conjuring Trick' on SDI Allocations

LD2806211189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Commentary by Aleksandr Korshunov]

[Text] It is reported from Washington that the Armed Services Commitee of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress has advocated a reduction of allocations for SDI, the star wars program. At the same time CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR reports that the Pentagon, despite the alleviation of the international

climate, continues to develop the latest armaments including space and nuclear systems. Our commentary is by my colleague journalist Aleksandr Korshunov.

[Korshunov] first of all it is worth looking into the aforementioned cuts in allocations to SDI. News agencies report that next year they will amount to $1,100 million dollars. An impressive sum, it would seem. But we are obliged for its solidity mainly to Washington's special arithmetic. The fact is, the figures characterizing the announced reduction are nothing else than the difference between the sum which the administration is proposing to allocate to star wars, and that which Congress agrees to. The White House proposed setting expenditure on SDI for next year to amount to $4,600 million dollars. But the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives of Congress insists on $3,500 million. It is evident that given such methods of accounting an even more impressive reduction can be produced. It is sufficient just to raise the initial sum. Say that demand amounts to $20 billion and Congress finally confirms 5; one gets a reduction equal to 15 billion. But these billions are nothing but air. Really, the technique of the conjuring trick is not complicated, but for a fuller idea of the state of affairs it is simply necessary to look at the real figures which characterize actual spending on the Strategic Defense Initiative. And here the reductions—the real, not inflated ones—look much more modest. For instance, for the financial year 1989 the developers of space weapons received $3,700 million. And if for next financial year Congress does ratify the article for expenditure on SDI to the sum of $3,500 million, then the reduction will amount to $200 million—certainly not the $1,100 million as is widely being claimed.

Moreover there are also the so-called Black Programs of the Pentagon which are not publicly debated by the legislators. They exist precisely for financing the development of exotic kinds of weapons—space weapons, invisible aircraft, etc.

Now, about the report by the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR. In its publication it mentions a wide range of those types of weapons which the Pentagon is showing principal interest in. In all, next financial year 10 percent more funds are being allocated to testing and manufacturing them than this year. Incidentally all the extremely modest sums which will nevertheless be saved as a result of the reduction in the allocations to SDI do not leave the pockets of the War Department but go to continue priority Pentagon programs and those which the War Department was once preparing to give up. Overall, the United States has not closed down a single military technical project, especially those connected with space weapons. President Bush the other day expressed his continuing adherence to the star wars program. This cannot fail to put one on guard because if strike systems are put in space the military-political stability may be upset. The consequences would be hard to foresee. It is clear that at the Soviet-U.S. talks now being held every opportunity must be taken to give up the most dangerous types of weapons, both existing ones and those that are being developed. There is not so much time left for that.

China

CPC's Jiang Zemin Hits Bourgeois Liberalization

PM0407134189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Leading Nucleus"]

[Text] Beijing, 2 July—The CPC is the steadfast leading nucleus in the socialist modernization of the PRC and there would be no new China without the Communist Party, Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, said at Saturday's [1 July] conference in the Chinese capital. This was devoted to the 68th anniversary of the CPC's formation and to questions of stepping up party building.

The speaker indicated the exceptional importance of a "substantial rectification" of party organizations at all levels "ranging from ideology to organizational features." According to him, this has been brought about by the existence of serious problems.

Jiang Zemin said that great significance is attached to strengthening political education among CPC members. The main attention here must be devoted to upholding the fundamental principles of the struggle against bourgeois liberalization, propagandizing the "spirit of hard struggle," and strengthening discipline.

The CPC Central Committee general secretary stressed that particular responsibility is placed on party leaders of all ranks, who must, indisputably, set an example in closing the gap between the party and the people and in resolving problems that worry people's masses everywhere.

PRC Official Cited on Future of Hong Kong, Macao

PM0407083989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Yu. Savenkov dispatch: "China: One Country and Two Systems"]

[Text] Beijing—China's policy toward Hong Kong and Macao will not change. This was stated on behalf of the Chinese Government by Ji Pengfei, director of the PRC State Council Office for Hong Kong and Macao Affairs.

He gave assurances that the Chinese Government strictly abides by its commitments under the joint government declarations of China and Britain on the future of Hong Kong and of China and Portugal on the future of Macao.

As is well known, the decolonization of these territories is to be carried out in 1997 and 1999 respectively. The Chinese leadership has repeatedly affirmed that it does

not intend to alter the capitalist system on those territories for at least 50 years. The concept of "one country and two systems" remains in force.

At the same time, however, Ji Pengfei stated, Hong Kong and Macao should not be used as a base for attempts to change the socialist system on the continent and overthrow the central government.

As Chinese newspapers report, this statement was made in response to the skepticism and concern evinced by certain people in China and abroad, particularly the inhabitants of Hong Kong and Macao. Their concerns boil down to one thing: Whether China's previously proclaimed attitude to these territories will be continued? At the same time, however, Ji Pengfei said, after expressing the hope that bilateral coopertation will continue in the transition period, "the work under way to gather opinions on the future draft Basic Law for the Xianggang (Hong Kong) Special Administrative Region of the PRC, which is to possess a high degree of autonomy, may be temporarily postponed."

The recent events in China are seen differently by compatriots in Hong Kong and Macao. In Ji Pengfei's view, it is perfectly understandable that these people mistake the nature of the events, since they do not know the whole truth. However, some people from Hong Kong and Macao have, according to Li Pengfei, breached Chinese laws and their actions have exacerbated the disorders in the countries.

A commentator on Hong Kong's SOUTH CHINA MORNING POST wrote the other day of the need for a more careful reading of that part of the joint Chinese-British governmental declaration which says that military units dispatched by the central government to the special administrative region for defensive purposes are not to interfere in the region's internal affairs. Hong Kong's governor, David Wilson, has stated: "Without forgetting what has happened in China, we should look to the future."

Hong Kong newspapers also report the desire of some local inhabitants to obtain the right of entry to and abode in Britain. More than 3 million Hong Kong inhabitants have British "overseas" passports, as they are called, but they do not give them an automatic right to live in Britain.

The SOUTH CHINA MORNING POST publishes the results of a poll. To the question "What will you do if you receive a guaranteed right of abode in Britain?" Only 6 percent answered that they would exercise the right. Sixty-two percent intend to remain in Hong Kong.

The poll results are commented on as follows: The guarantee of right of abode in Britain is regarded merely as a kind of "insurance."

Taiwan's Support of 'Mutiny' Called 'Regrettable'

LD2806141289 Moscow TASS in English 1134 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Beijing June 28 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kashirov

The Chinese Communist Party and Government will not change its policy on the Taiwan question: peaceful re-unification and one country, two systems, a representative of the Chinese Council of State said here on Tuesday [27 June].

Tang Shubei, deputy chief of the office for Taiwan Affairs at the Council of State, told the XINHUA news agency that the policy on the above problem was formulated taking account of the vital interests of the people of the entire country, including the Taiwanese population. It will not be changed now or in future due to the present situation in China.

In line with this policy and relevant laws, the Chinese Government will continue guaranteeing personal security and protecting the property and legitimate rights and interests of Taiwanese countrymen visiting their relatives, making tourist trips, investing capital or engaged in any other legitimate activities on the mainland.

Some Taiwanese countrymen, Tang went on to say, sent letters expressing understanding of and support for resolute measures taken by the central government to squash the recent counter-revolutionary mutiny in Beijing. A relatively large number of Taiwanese businessmen believe in stability and prosperity of the mainland and continue investing capital, despite recent events.

It is regrettable that the Taiwanese authorities repeatedly spoke of their support for an insignificant number of people who started the counter-revolutionary mutiny in Beijing. They only poured oil on the flames, he noted. Some even made statements calling for the overthrow of the Chinese Government. At the same time they continued their attempts to establish "two Chinas" or "one China, one international Taiwan".

The Taiwanese authorities must stop immediately any pronouncements or actions creating tension between the two sides of the Formosa Strait, said Tang.

Northeast Asia

Reportage on CPSU Delegation Visit to DPRK

DPRK President Receives Delegation

LD3006192489 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 30 Jun 89

[Text] Pyongyang June 30 TASS—Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea, president of the DPRK, today received a delegation of the Soviet Communist Party staying in the

DPRK on an official visit at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea. The delegation is headed by Viktor Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party.

The leader of the DPRK expressed gratitude to the Soviet side for supporting the holding of the thirteenth world youth festival in Pyongyang and for the arrival of a large group of Soviet youth for the festival. He expressed the confidence that the festival will be a success.

The conversation passed in a friendly atmosphere.

On the same day the delegation of the Soviet Communist Party headed by Nikonov placed wreaths at the Taesongsan [spelling as received] cemetery of revolutionaries and at the Liberation Monument built in Pyongyang to commemorate soldiers of the Soviet Army who fell in battles to rid Korea of Japanese militarists in August 1945.

A wreath was also placed at the monument to Chinese volunteers who were killed in action repulsing the U.S. aggression in Korea in 1950-1953.

Nikonov and the persons accompanying him toured the country.

Nikonov Activities Detailed

LD0307072689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 2 Jul 89

[Text] Pyongyang, 2 July (TASS)—The CPSU delegation headed by V.P. Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which is in the DPRK on an official visit at the invitation of the workers party of Korea [WPC] Central Committee, today held talks with So Kwan-hui, secretary of the WPC Central Committee.

The head of the Soviet delegation reported on the basic results of the first congress of USSR people's deputies, which has become a major political event in the life of Soviet society.

The Soviet Union, said V.P. Nikonov, adheres to a line aimed at the steady expansion and deepening of Soviet-Korean economic links, including those between the DPRK and the far eastern regions of the USSR. In the course of the conversation, the Soviet side raised specific proposals for cooperation in the field of agriculture, fisheries, construction, and the creation of joint enterprises, and in a number of other spheres of the economy. The importance of ensuring the efficiency and mutually advantageous nature of cooperation, and the precise and timely fulfillment of obligations in bilateral trade and economic relations was stressed.

The Korean side expressed its wish for the success of the Soviet people in advancing the processes of restructuring and confirmed its total support for the USSR's peace initiatives and the unchanging nature of the WPK course aimed at strengthening Soviet-Korean relations.

The DPRK, said So Kwan-hui, attributes enormous significance to economic cooperation with the Soviet Far East, especially to the creation of joint enterprises in this region. The first indications from the two countries' efforts are that there is great potential here for cooperation, including cooperation in agriculture.

The talks passed off in a businesslike, comradely atmosphere.

The same day, V.P. Nikonov visited the club of the Soviet delegation taking part in the 13th world festival of youth and students. V.I. Mironenko, first secretary of the All-Union Communist Youth League Central Committee, recounted that the representatives of USSR youth are making every effort to ensure that at the present forum they make a worthy contribution to the strengthening and development of the international youth and festival movement for the sake of the noble ideals of peace, friendship, and mutual understanding between peoples.

A meeting also took place on Sunday between V.P. Nikonov and staff of the embassy and of other Soviet institutions in the DPRK. He spoke about the progress of restructuring and the results of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and he also dwelled on certain topical tasks facing the staff of the Soviet missions in Pyongyang.

Kim Il-song, general secretary of the WPK Central Committee and president of the DPRK, held a reception in the evening in honor of the participants in and guests of the 13th World Festival of Youth and Students. Among the foreign delegations at the reception were V.P. Nikonov and the people accompanying him.

On Saturday, the CPSU delegation visited one of the leading horticultural farms in the suburbs of Pyongyang, where there was a detailed discussion of the ways of increasing fruit yields, the storage and processing of fruit, and the organization of fruit and vegetable cultivation.

Then V.P. Nikonov and the people accompanying him visited the National Economic Institute, the DPRK's leading scientific research and educational establishment in the field of economic organization and management. The guests were acquainted with the system for training and retraining of senior staff of party, state and economic bodies using the latest teaching resources, including computer equipment, and with the methods of managing and administering the agrarian sector of the DPRK's economy.

On the same day the Soviet delegation visited (mangende).

Nikonov Attends Youth Festival

LD0107191189 Moscow TASS in English 1629 GMT 1 Jul 89

[Text] Pyongyang July 1 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

The 13th World Festival of Youth and Students was opened in the capital of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on Saturday.

The opening ceremony, which took place at Nungnado stadium before 150,000 spectators, was addressed by the DPRK leader, Kim Il-song.

On behalf of the Korean people, he heartily greeted the young people and students from five continents and called on them to closely unite in the name of the common ideals of peace and friendship, irrespective of differences in ideology, public systems, political convictions or creed.

The ceremony was also addressed by Choe Ren-he, [name as received] chairman of the Central Committee of the Socialist Young Workers League, and Zimbabwe's President Robert Mugabe who is chairman of the Non-aligned Movement.

M. Salaymi [name as received] from the standing commission of the festival's international preparatory committee declared the 13th festival open. The festival's flag was then raised and the flame in the stadium's bowl lit.

Participants in the eight-day festival, the first to be held in Asia, include more than 15,000 young people from approximately 150 countries (delegations from a number of countries continue arriving).

The opening ceremony was attended by Viktor Nikonov, Politburo member and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, and the heads of delegations from a number of countries.

Nikonov Visits Soviet Club

LD0207180389 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 2 Jul 89

[Excerpts] Pyongyang July 2 TASS—By special TASS correspondents: Heated debates were held today at eight discussion centres and at an anti-imperialist tribunal of the youth forum on the first working day of the 13th World Youth Festival. A wide range of questions is under discussion: topical problems of nuclear disarmament, the need for a constructive dialogue among countries with different social systems, the struggle for national independence and self-determination, the rights of youth. [passage omitted]

The Soviet club at the festival was visited today by delegations of Portugal, Brazil, Cyprus, Nigeria, Togo, Burkina Faso, Nicaragua, Hungary and Uruguay. Viktor Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, on an official visit in the DPRK, was a guest at the club in the evening. [passage omitted]

Nikonov Ends Visit, Departs

LD0307101189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0935 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Pyongyang, 2 Jul (TASS)—The CPSU delegation led by V.P. Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which has been here on an official visit at the invitation of the KWP [Korean Workers Party] Central Committee, left the DPRK today.

At the airport the delegation was seen off by Ho Tam, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the KWP Central Committee; So Kwan-hui, secretary of the KWP Central Committee; and other officials. The seeing-off party included G.G. Bartoshevich, USSR ambassador to the DPRK.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnamese Defense Minister Wraps Up Visit

PM2306104789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Visit Continues"]

[Text] On 22 June Army General Le Duc Anh, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo and SRV minister of national defense, who is in the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, visited the USSR Armed Forces Central Museum.

Army General Le Duc Anh visited the Taman M.I. Kalinin motorized infantry guards division where he was acquainted with the Soviet servicemen's conditions of combat training and daily life.

In the afternoon Army General Le Duc Anh was acquainted with the class and laboratory base and organization of the study process at the USSR Armed Forces General Staff K.Ye. Voroshilov Military Academy.

Meets Yakovlev, Yazov, Moiseyev

PM3006140589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "In an Atmosphere of Mutual Understanding"]

[Text] On 23 June Army General Le Duc Anh, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo and SRV minister of national defense, who is paying an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union at the

invitation of Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, was received by A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the C SU Central Committee. Talks were held in an atmosphere of comradeship and full mutual understanding.

In the afternoon Army Gen Le Duc Anh had his final talks with Army Gen D.T. Yazov. The talks were held in a warm and cordial atmosphere.

Army Gen Le Duc Anh called on Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister. Questions of mutual interest were discussed during the talks.

Recalls WWII Role

BK2906104789 Moscow International Service in Vietnamese 1400 GMT 28 Jun 8

[Interview with SRV Defense Minister Le Duc Anh by radio observer Aleksey Lentsov; date and place not given—with portions recorded]

[Text] During his visit to the Soviet Union, General Le Duc Anh, Political Bureau member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee and Vietnamese minister of national defense, laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall in memory of fighters in the Soviet people's great war for national defense against German fascism. Among these fighters were a number of Vietnamese who participated in the defense of Moscow in late 1941 and early 1942. Talking about this with Comrade Aleksey Lentsov, our radio observer, the Vietnamese defense minister said:

[Begin recording] When German troops were approaching Moscow in their attack on the Soviet Union, it can be said that the Vietnamese communists and people were very worried and deeply moved. Many comrades feared the possibility that the German fascists would capture Moscow, the capital of the revolution, and they felt like crying. After the Soviet Armed Forces and people had driven the German Fascists from the Soviet Union, all party members and people who had knowledge of the Soviet Union were extremely elated. This encouraged the entire Vietnamese people to rise up, carry out the August revolution under the leadership of the Communist Party of Vietnam and establish the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

Thus, the fact that some of our comrades participated in the defense of Moscow against the German fascist army reflects the feelings of all of us—party members and people of Vietnam—toward the land of the October Revolution. What is the meaning of this? Those who could go to the Soviet Union at that time might have included some (?regimental commanders). These comrades, therefore, represented the sentiments of the Vietnamese people and cadres—who at that time had not seized power—toward the land of the October Revolution. [end recording]

Departs 26 Jun

PM2906143789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 First Edition p3

[Report by Captain 2d rank V. Pasyakin, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA own correspondent, under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 24 June Army General Le Duc Anh, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV) Central Committee Politburo and SRV national defense minister, who is in the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, arrived in Volgograd. He was met at the airport by Colonel General L.S. Shustko, troop commander of the North Caucasus Military District, and other officials.

On 25 June Army General Le Duc Anh, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and SRV national defense minister, visited the hero city of Sevastopol.

Army General Le Duc Anh paid a call on Admiral M.N. Khronopulo, commander of the Black Sea Fleet, inspected the "Slava" missile cruiser, and was acquainted with the city sights.

On 26 June Army General Le Duc Anh left the Soviet Union. The guest was seen off at the airport by Army General M.I. Sorokin, USSR deputy defense minister, Admiral M.N. Khronopulo, and other officials.

Arts Cooperation Plan Signed With Vietnam

BK2806075589 Hanoi VNA in English 0641 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Hanoi VNA June 28—A cooperation plan for 1989-90 between the Vietnam Plastic Arts Workers' Association and the Union of Artists of the USSR was signed here on June 26.

Signatories were Ms. Vu Giang Huong, deputy general secretary of the Vietnam Plastic Arts Workers' Association, and Victor Dubrovil, member of the Secretariat of the Union of Artists of the USSR.

Under the plan, the two sides will exchange visits, exhibitions, and information, and invite each other to participate in their seminar.

Near East & South Asia

Air Defense Chief Tretyak Visits Algeria

Seen Off to Algeria

PM2906143989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Departure for Algiers"]

[Text] On 26 June Army General I.M. Tretyak, USSR deputy defense minister, left Moscow for Algiers on an official visit.

Army General I.M. Tretyak was seen off at the airport by Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, USSR deputy defense minister, and generals and officers.

Those present included M. Yala, Algerian ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Greeted by Algerian Officials

LD2606191889 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 26 Jun 89

[Text] Algiers June 26 TASS—A Soviet military delegation arrived in the Algerian capital on an official visit Monday.

General Ivan Tretyak, USSR deputy defence minister and commander-in-chief of the Air Defence Troops, was greeted at the Algiers international airport by General Mohamed Atailia, general inspector of the Algerian National People's Army, Colonel Mohamed Boutammine, commander-in-chief of the Algerian Air Defence Troops, and other officials.

Meets With Algerian Defense Official

LD2806222189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1825 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Algiers, 28 Jun (TASS)—Army General I.M. Tretyak, commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, who is in Algeria on an official visit, has been received by General Moustapha Cheloufi, secretary general of the Ministry of National Defense of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria. The meeting was attended by General Mohamed Atailia, general inspector of the Algerian National People's Army, and other senior Army officers. There was an exchange of opinions on matters of mutual interest.

Today, Army General I.M. Tretyak arrived in the city of Oran, where he met the command of Algeria's second military region and visited a number of military installations.

Leaves Algeria for Home

LD0107090489 Moscow TASS in English 1757 GMT 30 Jun 89

[Text] Algiers June 30 TASS—Army General Ivan Tretyak, USSR deputy defence minister and commander-in-chief of antiaircraft defence forces, completed his official visit to Algeria.

General Tretyak departed for home today. At the Algerian international airport he was seen off by General Mohamed Atailia, inspector general of the Algerian National People's Army, Colonel M. Boutammine, commander of Algerian antiaircraft defence forces, and other officials.

Prime Minister Gandhi To Visit USSR in Jul

LD0507134589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1330 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 5 Jul (TASS)—Under an agreement which has been reached, Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi is to pay a friendly working visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet leadership in mid-July.

USSR POW Group Meets Bhutto in Pakistan

LD0507230689 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 5 Jul 89

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Aleksandrov]

[Text] Islamabad July 5 TASS—Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto today received a delegation of the People's Committee to Save Soviet Prisoners of War [POWs] in Afghanistan.

Bhutto said that Pakistan regarded the problem as exclusively humanitarian and did not want to link it with any other aspects of the Afghan war.

We understand that you have come here with great hopes and would like them to come true at least a little, Bhutto said.

She pointed out that the Pakistani Government had asked the rebel transitional government to release at least one or two Soviet soldiers, but that did not happen. She said that Pakistani representatives had met the rebels and seen that they were tough people, but promised that the Pakistani Government would continue contacts with them.

Bhutto listened to the requests of the parents of missing Soviet soldiers to help those Soviet families whose children are now at the hands of the Afghan rebels. She said that as a mother she understood their suffering and would do her best to help other mothers for the sake of humanity.

The Soviet delegation is ending its stay in Islamabad today and is leaving for Karachi where it is planning to meet local public.

Summing up the preliminary results of their trip to Pakistan, Iona Andronov, head of the People's Committee delegation, told TASS that "although not all hopes of the parents of missing Soviet POW's and other people in the Soviet Union has come true, the visit has, apparently, advanced the liberation process. We knew that we would not be able to do everything ourselves but as representatives of people's diplomacy we managed to step up this process."

"During our meeting with Benazir Bhutto we could see that she was sincerely sympathizing with the mothers of missing soldiers and we expect that her sincere words will be matched by sincere actions, because Pakistan's influence on the Afghan opposition is great," Andronov said.

U.S. Arms Aid to Pakistan 'Defies All Logic'

BK0507131389 Moscow in Hindi to India 1130 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Igor Demichev commentary]

[Text] Indian Defense Minister Mr Krishna Chandra Pant during his talks in Washington expressed concern at the continuing U.S. arms supplies to Pakistan. The U.S. military aid to Pakistan is not a new issue, and India is not raising this issue for the first time; but this time Delhi's concern is of a specific nature. Defense Minister Krishna Chandra Pant drew Washington's attention to this concern. According to Mr Pant, the present situation in the region is entirely different from that existing 2 years ago. The withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan has become a reality, and a trend toward the normalization of India-Pakistan relations is also on the horizon.

It is worth mentioning that Washington for quite some time—more than necessary—had been defending military supplies to Islamabad on the pretext of the Soviet forces' presence in Afghanistan. Large-scale U.S. military-economic aid had been given to Pakistan as a frontline state, which amounted to about $3.2 billion in the last 6 years. But considering the changing situation, it could be expected that at least for the time being this assistance, if not reduced, would not be increased.

U.S.-Pakistan military cooperation, however, defies all logic. The scale of assistance fixed for the next 6 years is one example in this context. A sum of $4.2 billion has been fixed for this purpose. It was reaffirmed during the Pakistani prime minister's recent visit to the United States and in her talks with President Bush that the scale and nature of the U.S.-Pakistan military cooperation will be maintained like before. After the visit, the Pentagon informed the Congress that it intends to supply sophisticated [words indistinct] helicopters, M-60 tanks, armored vehicles, howitzers, and other military equipment to Pakistan. It is not necessary to be a military expert to understand that reference is being made to attacking weapons. However, many statements made by Pakistani and U.S. officials convey the impression that these U.S. arms are being rushed to Islamabad to improve its defense capability. But, as is well known, no country threatens or has threatened Pakistan. The withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan has removed the last doubt in this connection.

One more thing is also known—that the lion's share of the U.S. arms supplied to Islamabad eventually reaches the India-Pakistan border. In this situation, Delhi's concern about the new military supplies to Islamabad is natural. India also believes that new U.S. arms consignments to Pakistan could negate some constructive changes recently witnessed in the India-Pakistan relations. As a result of the meetings between the leaders of India and Pakistan during the last year, a constructive political dialogue began between the two neighboring countries. They reaffirmed their faith in the Simla Agreement, which provides for settling of controversial issues through negotiations. According to regional observers, definite progress was witnessed in the talks on normalizing the Siachen Glacier area, joint operations against narcotics trafficking, and the development of tourism. Hope has been raised for a realistic change toward the direction of improved relations. But as the Indian defense minister said, the U.S. decision to continue military supplies to Pakistan could destroy the constructive process of improving bilateral relations between India and Pakistan, intensify the arms race in South Asia, and disturb the balance of power there.

The Indian defense minister also described the decision to gratify Islamabad with an additional 60 F-16's as a destabilizing element. This is a special topic for discussion. However, I would like to mention here that we are talking about 60 U.S. aircraft capable of delivering nuclear weapons. This is of special significance, because at present Pakistan possesses all the necessary equipment to produce 5 to 10 nuclear bombs—so says U.S. nuclear weapons expert Leonard Specter, and according to many articles in the U.S. newspapers, CIA analysts have also drawn the same conclusion. Despite this, and despite the Symington-Glen Amendment, President George Bush approved the supply of F-16's to Pakistan. The amendment bans U.S. aid to countries manufacturing nuclear weapons and not signing the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The approval marks a new step toward a nuclear arms race in the subcontinent, which is against the hopes and aspirations of the people of these countries.

India's policy is based on understanding the realities of this region, and Indian Defense Minister Krishna Chandra Pant drew the U.S. Administration's attention toward this policy.

Egyptian Industry Minister Concludes USSR Visit

LD0307205989 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS—"My visit to the Soviet Union gave me confidence in the fruitfulness of our further cooperation in ferrous metallurgy," Muhammad al-Wahhab, minister of industry of the Arab Republic of Egypt, told TASS. Muhammad al-Wahhab headed a delegation of Egyptian businessmen that was staying in the Soviet Union from June 26 to July 3.

During the stay in the USSR, the Egyptian delegation held negotiations at the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, visited a number of enterprises and organisations in various regions of the country: the Cherepovets and Lipetsk metallurgical complexes, the All-Union Institute of Refractory Materials in Leningrad and others. Many aspects of cooperation of the two countries in ferrous metallurgy were discussed and specified during these meetings. Contracts for the modernisation of a number of Egyptian metal works were signed. The sides also expressed interest in the development of mutual trade, specifically barter trade.

Muhammad al-Wahhab met today with Konstantin Katuchev, USSR minister of foreign economic relatons, and discussed with him prospects for upgrading commercial and economic relations between the Soviet Union and Egypt in the area of ferrous metallurgy and some other areas. On the same day USSR Minister of Ferrous Metallurgy Serafim Kolpakov and Muhammad al-Wahhab signed a joint protocol on the results of the Egyptian delegation's visit.

Israeli Acceptance of 'New PLO Policy' Urged

TA0507063889 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1630 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Yasir 'Abd-Rabbuh, the PLO representative to the Socialist International and head of that Palestinian organization's delegation to talks with the United States has said that the Palestinians support and even demand elections in the territories. The elections, he pointed out, must be under international supervision and be part of a comprehensive settlement. He expressed the fear that the Israeli Government had proposed elections solely to solve the problem of the intifadah [uprising], at the same time striving to maintain the status quo and avoid reaching a full resolution of the conflict. According to him, if the elections are to be a step toward a comprehensive settlement, it is essential that the permanent solution's principles be made clear. No one wishes to enter a tunnel unless he is certain that the other end is open, he said.

The Palestinians' apprehensions are based on fact. For many years, the tunnel was blocked by the Alignment and Likud governments' policy of three negatives: no to a withdrawal from the occupied territories; no to recognition of the PLO; no to an international conference. Has the end of the tunnel been unblocked? A new element recently joined the others on the list: No to an end to the heavy-handed policy in the territories, the deportations, house demolitions, administrative detentions, and other methods used to fight the intifadah.

How can the tunnel be opened? Some people in both the Arab world and the Palestinian movement contend that force can provide the answer to every problem and that the obstacle blocking the tunnel should simply be blown up together with Israel. We, however, do not believe that this is the solution. Wars and terror have never brought about peace and coexistence. What the Middle East nations need is a comprehensive settlement that would provide for the interests and the national rights of all the states and nations in the region: both the Jewish nation and its state, and the Arabs and their states. Israel has a legitimate right to an independent existence within secure and recognized borders. The Palestinian nation has the same right. This precept should be the basis of any settlement.

Yet how will the nations in the region be able to free the political process from the stalemate that has characterized it for many years? The election plan proposed by Israel can conceivably play a constructive role here. It is true that the elections will not solve all the problems; they are not a goal in themselves, and they do not envisage a comprehensive settlement process. In the framework of a comprehensive settlement, however, and as a first step toward peace, the election plan can be a beneficial contribution. This is to say that if the Israeli Government regards the election plan as part of a comprehensive process designed to bring about the implementation of the international community's resolutions on the Middle East, the conclusion is that a genuine change has taken place in Jerusalem's stance. If the answer is no, then there will be no progress in the Middle East.

We would like to hope that the Israeli leadership will eventually be ready to take action based on reality and agree to a settlement of acceptable compromise, because if it continues its former attempts to force the Arabs—mainly the Palestinians—into separate deals which are unacceptable to them, the tension in the Middle East will grow and the state of the Jews will face a tangible peril. Israeli rejection of the new PLO policy suits the purpose of the extreme Arab elements, who see only one way to solve the Middle East problem: through an unrelenting war against Israel.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Bovin Comments on Prospects for Peace in Angola

PM2806150189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[A. Bovin article under the rubric "Panorama of International Events. A Political Observer's Opinion": "Angola: A Glimmer of Hope"]

[Text] As reported earlier in IZVESTIYA, last week a meeting was held between President Jose Eduardo dos Santos of the People's Republic of Angola and Jonas

Savimbi, leader of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA]. An event of prime importance not only for Africa but also for international politics as a whole. Formally, it is a question of settling a purely internal, civil conflict. However, as we have been able to see more than once, such conflicts are most directly tied up with international affairs and can substantially influence their general tenor. That is because aligned behind each of the sides involved in the conflict there usually are forces of a global order.

The road to Gbadolite, the birthplace of President Mobutu Sese Seko of Zaire where the aforementioned meeting took place within the framework of the African summit, was a hard one. It took 14 years of civil war, hundreds of thousands of lives, and general destruction and devastation of the country before the government and the antigovernment grouping grasped that the interests of Angola, the interests of its rebirth, are the common interests of all the tribal formations which inhabit the country and that they are above group or private interests and above the differences relating to specific economic, social, and political problems.

Despite all the differences in specific conditions and in the practical results produced by the initial stages of the talks, it is possible to perceive similarities in the political processes which are developing in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Namibia and...If you study the accumulated experience, you can discern the outline of an optimum framework for settling conflicts (I am referring to its external, so to speak procedural forms, rather than the content, the essence of the compromises that are being sought).

1. Direct talks between the sides involved in the conflict. This would appear to be elementary. It is dictated by common sense and worldly wisdom. However, it is precisely this very first step which is often if not the most difficult, nonetheless very, very hard. The psychological and political barriers separating governments and rebels are simply too high.

In Afghanistan this step on which the government has insisted and is insisting has still not been taken. The rebels, hoping for a victory, prefer to continue the civil war. In Angola the rebels had long been demanding direct talks. Here it was the government which was objecting in the hope of a victory. However, in the end a realistic assessment of the situation has won the upper hand.

2. A cease-fire as a result of direct talks. Thus, dos Santos and Savimbi met 22 June and agreed on a ceasefire as of 0000 hours 24 June. The political maneuvers of the sides, the heat of the passions involved, and the specific nature of the civil war on whose "fronts" a multitude of virtually independent combat detachments are fighting make it difficult and sometimes impossible to implement a ceasefire, and so this issue has to be returned to again and again. In Lebanon, for instance, there have been at least 200 ceasefire agreements. Sometimes a ceasefire is viewed as part of a package with other elements of a settlement (Cambodia) and in this case it is put off until more general accords are reached.

In any event a stable and lasting ceasefire is the first sign of the earnestness of the sides' intentions.

3. and 4. The formation of a provisional (transitional) government of national unity (national reconciliation) made up of representatives of all the groupings taking part in the talks and the—after an agreed interval of time—general and free elections (possibly under international supervision).

I must repeat that what I have described is merely a framework which throws some light on the logic of a settlement. The actual content of the individual components of a settlement and the way and order in which they are put together may vary, depending on a multitude of specific factors and facts.

According to information supplied by UNITA, that organization controls the southeast of Angola (approximately one-third of the country's territory) and has an army of some 75,000 "bayonets". These figures may be exaggerated. But that is not important here. What is important is that UNITA has been legalized, it has been recognized as a negotiating party whose representatives will be included in the government, the administrative apparatus, and the Angolan Army. If events follow this course, then the withdrawal of Cuban troops is likely to be accelerated. As a gesture of goodwill, Luanda has already amnestied 50 members of UNITA who had been sentenced to death by firing squad and also released some 700 UNITA members from jail.

The glimmer of hope for peace and national reconciliation in Angola has to be viewed against the backdrop of the whole of Africa, the whole picture of the events taking place in the continent. It is a depressing picture.

There is fighting in Western Sahara, Ethiopia, Mozambique, and Sudan. The equilibrium in Chad and Uganda is unsteady. The Namibia settlement has not yet acquired its own momentum. Bloody tribal clashes are flaring up in various countries. Africa has long outstripped the former leader—Latin America—as regards coups d'etat.

The political instability is associated with economic and social instability. Of the 42 least developed countries of the planet, 28 are in Africa. The population growth rate is higher than the gross national product growth rate, which leads to hunger, poverty, and suffering. The "strategy of settlement" fashionable in the eighties (stringent economy measures, rising prices, reduction of the state sector, and so forth), intensively recommended by the IMF and the World Bank has produced a revival in certain sectors of the economy and simultaneously exacerbated social tensions.

The creation of new conditions and new forms of social life is clearly lagging behind the destruction of the old, habitual traditional orders. The impoverishment and deracination of huge masses of people and failure to provide them with social guarantees are on the increase. These are the main causes of political instability, putsches and coups d'etat, tribal clashes, and all kind of conflicts and wars.

Logic then compels us to think along the following lines. Only development and changes in the socioeconomic foundation can create the preconditions for a stabilization of political life and political relations. On the world-historic plane this is or rather will be the case. However, in terms of specific situations a political settlement can serve as the lever which influences the socioeconomic sphere and creates (can create) favorable conditons for development.

In any case, an end to the civil war and the unification of the country's national and political forces are essential, if insufficient on their own, to ensure that Angola is able to taste the fruits of its independence.

CPSU Greets South Africa Communist Party Head

PM2706110189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee greetings message: "To Comrade Joe Slovo, general secretary of the South African Communist Party"]

[Text] Dear Comrade Joe Slovo!

Please accept our sincere congratulations on your reelection to the high post of general secretary of the South African Communist Party.

We wish you and all South African Communists successes in the struggle to eliminate the shameful apartheid system and to achieve national and social liberation.

[Signed] CPSU Central Committee

Calls on Congress To Stop Apartheid

PM2706160789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "South African Communists' Congress"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has sent greetings to the recent Seventh South African Communist Party [SACP] Congress. Your congress, the greetings message says, has assembled at a time when favorable changes are under way in the world. Against this background the South African Government's racist policy seems even more of an anachronism. South African Communists, despite the authorities' reprisals and terror, are continuing their courageous struggle to eradicate the apartheid regime and safeguard working people's vital interests. Your party has become an integral part of the broad front of democratic liberation forces headed by South Africa's African National Congress. The fraternal solidarity between the CPSU and the SACP has been reaffirmed.

The congress adopted a new party program stressing the need to eliminate racist tyranny in South Africa; ways to achieve this goal are being examined, and it was noted that the armed struggle should not be opposed to dialogue, talks, or justifiable compromise. The program points to the role of the working class as the decisive force in the national democratic revolution in South Africa.

The congress reelected Joe Slovo as SACP general secretary, and Daniel Tloome as national chairman.

East Europe

TASS Cites MTI on Janos Kadar Death

LD0607085189 Moscow TASS in English 0844 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Text] Budapest July 6 TASS—The Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party has announced with profound grief that Janos Kadar died today morning after a lengthy, grave illness, MTI news agency has reported.

Information about the funeral will be given later.

Navy Commander Chernavin Departs for Poland

LD0507123889 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—The commander-in-chief of the Soviet navy and deputy defence minister of the USSR, Admiral Vladimir Chernavin, left today for an official friendly visit to the People's Republic of Poland.

According to the admiral, his visit will be of great use as naval cooperation and ship-building will rank high on the agenda of talks with his Polish counterparts. Discussions are also expected to take place on the use of the allied forces in the Baltic under the defence-oriented doctrine of the Warsaw treaty.

"Personal encounters with the leadership of the Polish army and navy will help further consolidate the cooperation of our armed forces within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty," Admiral Chernavin said.

Military Plane Collides With Polish Glider

LD0607055989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0534 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Text] Warsaw, 6 Jul (TASS)—As reported by a spokesperson of the Polish Defense Ministry, yesterday at 1304 local time, an aircraft of the northern group of Soviet

troops air force section, which was on a training flight in the region of Lubin, Legnica Voivodship, collided with a Pirat glider. As a result of the collision, the glider's pilot, Macie Majewski, died.

The military aircraft landed at its airfield of registration. A special commission, in which Polish and Soviet military experts are taking part, is investigating the circumstances of the incident.

Lithuania's Brazauskas Leads Delegation to Poland

Vilnius on Visit, Treaty

LD2806114489 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 26 Jun 89

[Excerpt] A delegation of the Lithuanian Communist Party led by the first secretary of the Central Committee, Algirdas Brazauskas, is on a visit to Poland. In Warsaw Algirdas Brazauskas and the leader of the Polish United Worker's Party, Wojciech Jaruzelski, have signed a cooperation treaty between the two parties.

Radio Vilnius commentator (Stanus Lopieka) has reported that the treaty was signed by Wojiech Jaruzelski himself and not by one of the Central Committee secretaries, as had been planned initially. This fact gave the treaty more weight. Apart from the cooperation between the two parties, the treaty provided for extensive ties of Polish and Lithuanian public organizations, scientists and institutions of higher learning. The treaty envisages favorable conditions of cooperation between the scholars of the two countries in the field of social and humanitarian sciences, with due regard to the history of the Lithuanian and Polish peoples and the cultural impact they had on each other. It has been agreed to set up a joint commission of Lithuanian and Polish historians to deal with these matters and to make archives in both countries available to those interested.

According to the Lithuanian radio reporter, the hall in which the treaty was signed was decorated with the Lithuanian and Polish national flags. The Soviet national flag was to be there too, but they thought better of it as it is a two-way cooperation between the neighboring countries, Lithuania and Poland. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian-Polish Program Signed

PM2906120789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Program Adopted"]

[Text] Warsaw, 26 Jun—A program for direct cooperation between the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee was signed today by A.-M.K. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, who is heading a Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] party delegation which has arrived in Warsaw, and W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee.

The document provides for organizing the regular exchange of experience in the sphere of party work, holding consultations, practical classes, and seminars for party workers, helping establish working contacts between city, rayon, voivodship, and parish soviets of people's deputies and helping broaden and enhance the effectiveness of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the Lithuanian SSR and Poland. They outlined means of broadening contacts in the sphere of public education, culture, and publishing and contacts between public and youth organizations.

The program was elaborated in light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 10th PZPR Congress, the Declaration on Soviet-Polish Cooperation in the Sphere of Ideology, Science, and Culture and in view of the similarity and commonality of the Lithuanian and Polish peoples' historical destinies and cultures and the profound good-neighborly and friendly relations between the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and the PZPR Central Committee.

A conversation took place between W. Jaruzelski and A.-M.K. Brazauskas.

Brazauskas Meets Jaruzelski

PM0507140589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 89 First Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Meeting In Warsaw"]

[Text] Warsaw, 29 June—The official part of the visit to Poland by a Lithuanian party delegation, headed by A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, ended yesterday with a tour of Suwalki Voivodship, with which the working people of Soviet Lithuania have had direct links for nearly 25 years now.

During the 3-day stay in Poland a program of cooperation between the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee was signed. The document, elaborated in the light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and 10th PZPR Congress and the declaration on Soviet-Polish cooperation in the sphere of ideology, science, and culture, envisages a regular exchange of experience in the sphere of party work and the holding of consultations and seminars for party workers.

A. Brazauskas was received by PZPR Central Committee First Secretary W. Jaruzelski. During the conversation it was stressed that the processes of Soviet perestroyka and Polish socialist renewal have similar goals and are the result of an in-depth analysis of contemporary phenomena and the concept of socialism in the new conditions. It is this that creates the foundation for

bringing together the broadest circles of society and expanding and deepening friendly links between the two countries at national and regional levels.

West Europe

USSR Envoy Apologizes To Belgium Over MiG Crash

LD0507180189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1611 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Brussels, 5 Jul (TASS)—F.P. Bogdanov, USSR ambassador to Belgium today delivered official apologies to M. Eyskens, Belgium's external relations minister, in connection with the catastrophe of the Soviet fighter aircraft, which crashed on Tuesday in the area of the Belgian town of Courtrai. He expressed condolences to the family of the Belgian citizen who was killed and said that the Soviet side will compensate for material damage inflicted by the crashed aircraft. M. Eyskens spoke of the need to improve the warning system of interested parties during incidents of this kind.

Gremitskikh on Delayed Notification

AU0507182189 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1700 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Interview with Yuriy Gremitskikh, deputy spokesman of the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry, by Hanno Schneider in Moscow; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Schneider] Why was the Soviet Union so late in briefing the authorities in the FRG and Belgium and its ambassadors, the Soviet ambassadors to these countries, on this accident?

[Gremitskikh] Well, I can say that there was a certain confusion. People did not exactly know what had really happened, that is, a plane without a pilot flying for such a long time and so far. Even experts did not believe that such a thing is possible. This caused the delay, as you have correctly stated, in briefing our ambassadors, the affected states, and the public.

Shaposhnikov Comments on Incident

PM0507160589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 6

[I. Andreyev and P. Golub report incorporating interview with Lieutenant General of Aviation Ye. Shaposhnikov, first deputy commander in chief of the Air Force, under the rubric "Details for IZVESTIYA": " 'Pilotless' MiG in the Sky Over West Europe"—date and place not given]

[Text] As has already been reported, a Soviet warplane whose pilot ejected while carrying out a training mission in Polish airspace, flew on unpiloted for a considerable distance and crashed on Belgian territory.

The impact and explosion happened, according to AFP, at 1055 local time on 4 July in southern Belgium near the town of Courtrai. The crash in a densely populated area with hundreds of people per square kilometer, did not occur without a tragedy. Nineteen-year-old Wim Delaere, who was staying at his parents' house, was killed. Worried that the aircraft's combat "payload" might explode, the Courtrai burgermeister ordered the 150 people who live in the crash zone to be evacuated.

"It was a miracle the consequences weren't more serious," Belgian Minister of the Interior Tobback stated. While having ruled out the possibility of the fighter's flying over Brussels, he noted the exceptional danger of an incident caused by the fact that the aircraft could have reached the Lille industrial zone on French territory not far from Courtrai.

The Soviet MiG-23 swing-wing fighter was intercepted in the north of the FRG by two U.S. F-15 fighters. After initially trying to make contact with the violator, the interceptor pilots realized that the MiG was empty. This was proved by the "uncertain" movements of the aircraft, typical of an unpiloted craft. There was no rush to shoot it down. They were scared of the consequences of debris falling on densely populated areas. They proposed eliminating the dangerous guest over the sea, somewhere in the region of the Strait of Dover, General J. Sharle [name as transliterated], chief of staff of the Belgian Armed Forces, stated.

The route taken by the uncontrolled MiG after the pilot ejected was seen by Western experts to be the following: northern Poland, GDR, FRG, The Netherlands, Belgium. Over Dutch territory, K. Ferenbakh [name as transliterated], a spokesman for that country's air force, claimed, the aircraft was flying at an altitude of between 10 and 13 km.

In connection with the incident AFP cites in its reports a similar case from 5 years ago involving a French Mirage 5F warplane. On 1 June 1984 it continued flying for around 40 minutes after a pilot ejected because of engine problems. The fighter was shot down by the French Air Force in a thinly populated region near the town of Karlsruhe (FRG).

The editorial office asked Lieutenant General of Aviation Ye. Shaposhnikov, first deputy commander in chief of the Air Force, to comment on this unusual and alarming incident.

[Shaposhnikov] According to our records this is a unique occurrence in the history of combat aviation. At least I cannot recall an aircraft whose pilot has ejected (because of an obvious engine problem) flying such a long way uncontrolled.

[IZVESTIYA] So just what happened?

[Shaposhnikov] The MiG-23 pilot—Pilot First Class Colonel Nikolay Skuridin—was meant to carry out an ordinary training mission. He had only taken off and had reached an altitude of 130-150 meters when he felt a

sharp fall in thrust—this is a single-engine aircraft. It seemed as though the afterburner had shut down automatically, and it was also surging, judging by a loud banging in the left air intake. This, you know, is a problem associated with the engine "choking" when air ingress through the compressor is impeded. There is a terrible vibration and a sharp reduction in the power avaiable to the aircraft... The incident was also shown by instrument readings. So far we have not recovered the "black box" but, in the pilot's words, the engine's revolutions fell by one-half. Altitude was also reduced.

According to regulations, Skuridin reported the incident to the "ground" and decided to eject. He pointed the craft in the direction of the sea, steered it away from the population center, and abandoned the fighter. Ground services tracked the aircraft until it disappeared beyond the horizon some 4-5 km away. Let me emphasize that the pilot was confident that the MiG would crash into the sea at a minimum distance away from the point of ejection: It was at a very low altitude, about 100 meters.

[IZVESTIYA] Was this when the aircraft was, as the saying goes, written off?

[Shaposhnikov] No, it was sought by overflying the sea in the assumed crash area... So far I have no information about radar systems in the territory of the Polish People's Republic and the GDR picking up the "revived" aircraft. And, was it actually picked up?

[IZVESTIYA] The aircraft proved to be very "airworthy" without a pilot. Why?

[Shaposhnikov] That is the sort of craft it is. During take-off and at slow speed its wings are almost straight, with minimum sweep and quite a sizeable wingspan. The aircraft, so to say, does not force its way through the air but actually flies. Moreover, for this flight it was not fitted with missiles, bombs, or pod-mounted fuel tanks. Even so, we are amazed by the distance it did manage to cover. The range proved much greater than we had assumed.

[IZVESTIYA] What made the MiG crash, if it crossed over The Netherlands at an altitude of more than 10 km?

[Shaposhnikov] Judging by everything, it had used up all its fuel. As regards the altitude given by the West, I have my doubts about it. Actually, I hope that we will receive the "black box" and will be able to accurately determine everything.

[IZVESTIYA] Are representatives of our air force traveling to the accident site in Belgium?

[Shaposhnikov] Yes, talks are under way. If we are given the "green light," a commission headed by Lieutenant General of Aviation Ye. Rusanov, deputy chief of the Air Force Main Command, will fly there. Incidentally, the group also includes an expert empowered to resolve questions associated with compensating the Belgian side for any damage.

[IZVESTIYA] Do you know that a Belgian teenager was killed and a home was destroyed?

[Shaposhnikov] Yes, a tragedy did unfortunately ensue. I would like to take this opportunity to express our sincere regret for what has happened and profound condolences to the dead boy's family. We, just like people in the West, are perturbed by this incident, by its actual and potential consequences.

[IZVESTIYA] What do you think, will this be the occasion when the armed forces of Warsaw Pact and NATO countries will have to immediately embark on a dialogue and notify one another of any dangerous situation?

[Shaposhnikov] There is certainly a need for effective communications in situations like this. Alas, such contacts have still not been established at present.

Further Reportage on Gorbachev's Visit to France

Gorbachev, Mitterrand Speeches 4 Jul

PM0507150989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 89 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report: "USSR-France: Dialogue Acquires New Dimensions And Depth"]

[Excerpts] Paris, 4 Jul—M.S. Gorbachev arrived in France today. French President Francois Mitterrand and his wife greeted M.S. Gorbachev and R.M. Gorbacheva as they descended from the aircraft at Orly Airport, where the state flags of the USSR and France were flying.
[passage omtited]
F. Mitterrand and M.S. Gorbachev exchanged speeches of greeting.
F. Mitterrand said:

Mr President!
Mrs Gorbacheva!

We are happy to be welcoming you to our country for the second time within the context of an official visit. It enables us, through you, to greet the Soviet people and say: Welcome!

I personally am glad to see you. It is the sixth time we have been able to have an in-depth exchange of views. I hope that the few days we shall spend together will enable us to examine all the questions relating to the situation in the world and the problems of development. We will also be talking about our countries and about Europe. Rest assured that the French welcome you with joy, with great hope, and they see these facts as new manifestations of the historic friendship that unites us.

Esteemed Mrs Gorbacheva, who gave us such a fine reception in Moscow, in your country, you must know that we are very happy to receive you in France.

Mr President, you and your activities arouse lively interest in France. I would like to repeat the words of greeting and say once again: Welcome to our country!

Thank-you.

M.S. Gorbachev said:

Esteemed Mr President!

Esteemed Mrs Mitterrand!

I want to express my thanks and the thanks of all my colleagues for the warm words of welcome which you have spoken on your own behalf and on behalf of the French people.

Mr President, we are very glad to be in France today and to be able, on behalf of the Soviet people, who have deep feelings of friendship for the French, to express our deep respect for France and its people. Our people value highly the ties of friendship and cooperation which bind us to France and to the people of this country. I also want to say that we value highly the political dialogue we have established and which is developing, acquiring both considerable dimensions and depth. I welcome what you said about the good days that lie ahead and about the opportunity to continue this dialogue.

Thank-you for greeting us.

After the welcome ceremony at Orly Airport M.S. Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand went by car to the Marigny Palace, which is near the president's residence—the Elysee Palace. The important Soviet guest will be staying there during the visit.

The Champs Elysees and other boulevards and squares in the French capital were decorated with the two countries' state flags. Despite the fact that for a good one-third of Parisians July marks the start of the vacation season, thousands of inhabitants turned out to greet and applaud M.S. Gorbachev.

It is the Soviet leader's second visit to France, but now he is making the trip as head of the Soviet state, elected by the Congress of People's Deputies and given the people's mandate. So the Paris summit talks are seen in the context of the Soviet policy of restructuring, new political thinking, and implementation of congress instructions.

A lot of hard work is to be done in Paris—this is what strikes one on studying the Soviet leader's busy schedule for the visit to France. And the work began immediately on his arrival in the capital. The first conversation between M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand was held in the Elysee Palace. This intimate dialogue between heads of state, it is believed here, will set the tone of the further talks, which end on 5 July with the signing of Soviet-French documents.

The Soviet-French summit is being closely followed by newspapers, radio, and television and the interest is understandable. The visit is taking place at a time when Europe is going through a new period of development that is characterized by a transition from confrontation to dialogue. The USSR and France can make a substantial contribution to the development of this process. Recent public opinion polls conducted here have invariably demonstrated that the French public is in favor of further strengthening relations between the two countries and ensuring a peaceful climate in Europe.

This mood, local observers admit, is largely due to the political and economic transformations in the Soviet Union and the restructuring of its foreign policy. Of course, when reading a variety of newspapers one can often come across items containing ingrained elements of distrust and skepticism vis-a-vis our country and the prospects for restructuring. But there can be no doubt that the two countries are filled with a desire to build new bridges on the path of mutual rapprochement and work together to achieve common goals. This in particular is indicated by the fact that, as French Foreign Minister R. Dumas announced recently, around two dozen agreements in all manner of areas—political, trade-economic, and cultural— are to be signed in Paris. Their implementation will aid the practical solution of the various problems our country and France are encountering.

The journalists covering the Soviet head of state's visit to France asked him to evaluate the visit so far. In response to the correspondents, M.S. Gorbachev said:

The president and I have already resumed our conversations. They are touching on a wide range of issues. I must say that we are privileged to be talking with the French president. We value the high level of these conversations and their significance not only in terms of our bilateral relations, but in terms of assessing the problems of world politics. That is number one. Second: We are very glad to be here when our friends, the friendly country of France, and the French people are celebrating a great date—the jubilee of the French Revolution. By our presence we are expressing our respect for France and for its people.

The issues we are discussing concern cooperation in all spheres at the present stage, the new stage, a crucial stage in history. All countries are adapting to the challenge of the times, and this was the main theme of the first meeting with Mr President. But it ended with our wanting to hear again news about the implementation of the idea that was discussed in conversation with Mr Presiodent in Moscow. We agreed at the time to discuss

the possibilities of cooperation. I welcome this cooperation within the framework of the implementation of the idea we call the building of a common European home. We hope, together with the president, that our peoples will actively participate in devising the architecture, drawing up the plan, and building this home, and will then take their place alongside the other inhabitants of this home. And this means that contact between peoples and cultural exchanges will increase. It is a very important element of contact among the European peoples. Therefore I thank the president for the invitation to return to this idea once again. We will talk some more about this, I think, in practical terms.

Asked by correspondents whether he was satisfied with the start of the talks, M.S. Gorbachev replied: I am satisfied, completely satisfied!

But the problems of today do not overshadow events of great historic importance which are currently being celebrated in France. It will soon be the bicentenary of the great French Revolution. The French love and revere their history. It is easy to see this today, when one observes the painstaking preparations being made by Paris and the whole country, from the English Channel to the Mediterranean, to celebrate this anniversary. In the center of the capital, on the Place de la Concorde, grandstands are being erected for Parisians and visitors, who will witness a magnificant pageant on 14 July, Bastille Day. A large number of central streets in the city will be given over to pedestrians for several days.

This afternoon M.S. Gorbachev went to the Place de la Bastille.

Parisians appreciated the fact that immediately after his first meeting with the French president the Soviet head of state paid tribute to the event for which the entire country is currently making preparations.

On the way to the bank of the Seine M.S. Gorbachev's car stopped and he went up to a group of Parisians. The Soviet leader addressed them, saying: Our peoples have deep common historical roots and the friendship between them must be developed. It is like a tree. Even if it has big roots it will dry up unless it is watered. Let us protect it.

M.S. Gorbachev was given an enthusiastic reception by the inhabitants of the capital, forming a thick wall surrounding the whole of the Place de la Bastille. They were chanting in French and Russian: Gorbachev! Friendship! Many of them were holding placards with "Welcome!" written on them. M.S. Gorbachev looked around one of France's chief monuments, with Roland Dumas, minister of state for foreign affairs, explaining things for him.

...There was another stop on the Quai du Louvre. There was a casual chat with people gathered there. They included many tourists from various countries. You have a real international atmosphere here, M.S. Gorbachev joked and then added, seriously: It is simply a pleasure for me to see you all here together.

One interlocutor recommended sticking to the course taken by the Soviet leadership. "Carry on with what you are doing," he said. "What we have in mind," M.S. Gorbachev replied, "is very difficult and very serious and the people have accepted it, with their minds and hearts. Now everything must be calculated, so that it is not ruined. We cannot stop, there is no going back. That would be a tragedy. However we must not go forward in leaps and bounds, but with a measured stride, step by step."

In the evening French President Francois Mitterrand and his wife gave a dinner in the Elysee Palace in honor of the head of the Soviet state.

The Soviet side was represented at the dinner by E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, L.A. Voronin and other officials, and also a large group of representatives of the Soviet public, scientists, and cultural figures, who are in Paris at the moment.
F. Mitterrand and M.S. Gorbachev exchanged speeches.

Speech By F. Mitterand:
Mr President!
Mrs Gorbacheva!

First of all I want to say how happy I am to be entertaining you this evening in the Elysee Palace, that is, you, your wife, and the Soviet delegation.

Our visit is one link in the chain of political dialogue between the Soviet Union and France, which we decided in 1985 should correspond to the role of our two countries in Europe and the world as a whole. This dialogue, which is developing in an atmosphere of respect for the partner, is demonstrating the possibility of conducting a constant, constructive, and searching debate betwen us.

I have not forgotten either the fact that your first official visit to the West was to Paris or the reception I have had twice in Moscow. Now the conditions exist for the quality of our political, economic, and cultural relations to be on a par with the respect our two peoples have for one another, as members of the same European family, heirs to the same civlization, and united, when it has been necessary, in brotherhood in arms.

Our visit is taking place at a moment which, everyone feels, could be exceptional for our continent. For the first time in the past 50 years we have the chance to take Europe out of the era of division and confrontation, directing it onto the path of reconciliation and concord, if, of course, we manage not to miss the chance.

The position you adopted and which you now occupy will play a big part in this great change. You know how closely we are following the courageous and ambitious reform project you have embarked on. How can one not

welcome restructuring when it provides Soviet citizens with more freedom and well-being, when it intensifies peaceful cooperation between the USSR and the surrounding world?

Europe is now living in an era of interdependence. We can regard no event in Moscow, Warsaw, Budapest or anywhere else with indifference. Some 12 Western countries, on the basis of common democratic values, have built a community based on freedom of entry and equality of its members. Without any intention of breaking away economically or technologically from the rest of the continent, but only because it is perfectly natural to embark on shaping the future if one feels ready to do so. We have just completed another stage in Madrid, by laying the foundation for monetary and economic union. The European community is a reality today, one that is recognized as such and does not threaten anyone. Its desire for cooperation with other willing states needs no further proof. In the past two years it has concluded agreements with Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia at their request amd has established relations with CEMA. Talks are taking place at the moment with the USSR and Bulgaria. Not to mention, of course, the long-established cooperation the developing countries, which is confirmed by the Lome Convention, with the members of European Free Trade Association, and with the countries of North Africa. During France's presidency, which is about to begin, I intend to continue and strengthen these relations in their entirety. A community that is untied and strong in itself, open to the outside world, and dependent on no one is a magnet that presents an unequalled opportunity for rapprochement and stability in Europe.

Each of the 12 partners knows also how much will and persistence it needed to get this far. None of it would have been possible without French-West German reconciliation, without the countries of southern Europe returning to democracy, without the desire to counteract outside pressure and overcome national egoism.

No one would agree to exchange these achievements for chimeras. But we can hear the call from outside the community. We can sense over here and over there, throughout the continent, the desire to make every effort to eliminate the Europe that was the product of the vicissitudes of war and was the victim of an artificial split.

The consolidation of the equilibrium acquired at a high price no longer appears incompatible today either with the broadening of democracy or with the need for individual states' security or with the desire of citizens for freedom.

Proceeding from such preconditions, the idea which you have advanced of a common European home can acquire sound foundations. The chief thing is to agree on what we want to put into it and how to tackle the business. We have to smooth the many obstacles that exist between the two halves of Europe, dispel mistrust, and destroy the barriers before the occupants of the future home feel an atmosphere of well-being and trust for themselves in it. The exposure of these difficulties has in itself marked significant progress, as well as the fact that all Europeans have finally begun holding joint talks on this subject in continuation of the process begun in Helsinki. I mean, in particular, the talks being held in Vienna on conventional armed forces in Europe and the recent Paris conference on the human dimension. I am pleased that unprecedented cooperation has been established between our two countries with a view to elaborating the bases of the European rule-of-law state. Our plans can be conceived of only within the framework of a community of free peoples and citizens protected against arbitrariness and intimidation and enjoying freedom of movement and mutual familiarization with each other's cultures and ways of life.

At the dawn of the new millennium we have to pass on to the new generations, who for too long were hostages of the irrevocable past, an approach to Europe's future which will restore their faith in themselves. We will promote contacts between civic societies and exchanges of young people. We will involve the intelligentsia in the plan to draw up a charter of European freedoms. We will act jointly to preserve our natural environment. We will turn modern communications equipment into a connecting link between us, into a means of preserving our national originality and European culture with respect to what is universal in it.

We began discussing these questions during our previous meetings. I have always found you, Mr President, an attentive and open interlocutor. Everyone can ascertain that steps forward were taken. I am pleased that in the course of one and the same trip you are simultaneously the guest of France and of the Council of Europe. I would like your speech in Strasbourg to mark a new step on the way to Europe's reconciliation.

The new impulse toward disarmament is also manifested in just the same way in Europe. We are witnesses to a very edifying phenomenon. All European countries, as well as the United States and Canada, recognize the need to regard the balanced and controlled reduction of conventional arms henceforth as the priority and to seek to bring their viewpoints closer together in the single desire to move forward.

France, which indefatigably demanded that the Vienna talks be started, takes an active part in them. In keeping with this spirit, we have supported President Bush's recent proposals inspired by the will, which we share, to conclude as quickly as possible an agreement guaranteeing security for all.

Disarmament also affects other spheres. The year 1989 began with the Paris conference on chemical disarmament, which ended in success, for all the world's countries there declared their will to sign as soon as possible a convention prohibiting the development, production,

stockpiling, and use of these weapons, as well as providing for the destruction of the weapons that exist—and in certain cases there are quite a lot of them. It is very good that progress is to be observed at the Geneva talks. It only remains to bring them to a successful conclusion.

Incidentally, I am very glad that you have resumed talks with the United States on reducing strategic arms. In this respect too we would like a quick and successful conclusion to this work you have begun.

The international obligations of France and the Soviet Union and, in particular, their status as permanent members of the UN Security Council naturally prompt them to consult each other with a view to helping to create conditions for a return to peace wherever there are still conflicts.

In keeping with this spirit, during our talks we have touched on the situation in Cambodia, Afghanistan, and the Near East. Your recent statements on Lebanon represent a reassuring response to the appeal which I made in April—to you, in particular—to end the sufferings of the population of Beirut and to help Lebanon regain the prerogatives of a sovereign state.

Our role now in the Arab-Israeli conflict is to induce the opponents to recognize each other as interlocutors and to ensure a useful framework for their dialogue. The international conference for which you and I have been calling since 1986 remains more than ever an urgent necessity.

Now, in the year of the bicentennial of the French Revolution, when a great wind of hope is blowing throughout the world, all freedom-loving peoples have perceived the events in China as a sad regression. The fact that young workers and students have been executed for peacefully demonstrating their love of democracy shows how unstable any gain is, how unreliable any progress.

Our countries are once again learning to work together in a Europe and a world which are experiencing changes. During my visit to Moscow last November we agreed on an ambitious work program. Seven months later I state with satisfaction that the pledges have been fulfilled. A couple of dozen agreements covering important spheres of our cooperation will be signed in Paris.

I will confine myself to mentioning the most significant results. Our economic cooperation will be facilitated by more efficient cooperation structures. A French cultural center will be opened in Moscow, and a Soviet one in Paris. Thousands of young people on each side will visit families in the other country as early as next year. The training of Soviet manager cadres will begin in France. The agreement on cooperation in the sphere of high-definition television attests to the joint will to attain an all-European norm. The resumption of exchanges between our armed forces symbolizes a return to relations founded on greater trust. It is very good that the relations maintained by our governments, our entrepreneurs, and our cultural figures, many of whom are present here today, have made it possible to gather such a harvest in such a short time.

Mr President, I wish cooperation between the Soviet Union and France to resemble what we want to accomplish in Europe and to express greater solidarity.

I would now like to propose that all who have come here this evening bear witness to the friendship which France feels for your country and that you, ladies and gentlemen, raise our glasses to your health, Mr President, to the health of Mrs Gorbacheva, whose presence introduces a note of charm and culture, to which none of us is indifferent, and also to the health of all who are dear to you, and join in the good wishes addressed to your country. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Address at Sorbonne

PM0607125389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 89 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report under the general heading "Seeking Common Criteria for Progress": "M.S. Gorbachev Speech" at the Sorbonne in Paris on 5 July]

[Text] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen: I am grateful for the opportunity to meet you in such a famous place in Paris and at such a significant point in your and our history. As I was thinking about what I was going to say to you here, I naturally turned to the thought of the link between times, and to be more specific, to the link between events that were turning points in the history of humanity, such as the great revolutions of 1789 and 1917, and also of their relation, of the relation between their legacy and what is happening now in the world, in which our restructuring has already, I hope, occupied a generally recognized place.

The great French Revolution was a new starting point for the entire subsequent history of Europe and of a significant part of the rest of the world. But is has long been noted that the most major sociopolitical revolutions are always preceded by philosophical revolutions. The French Revolution owed much to the philosophy of the enlightenment, to the ideas of equality and the natural rights of the human being, the supremacy of law, the division of power, people's sovereignty and social contract, and the ideas of Voltaire, Montesquieu, Diderot, Holbach, Mably and Rousseau. In turn, the intellectual and political legacy of the French Revolution and the Paris Commune served as one of the foundations of a new philosophical revolution carried out by the thinkers of the working class movement, Marx, Engels, and Lenin. This was the threshold of the October Socialist Revolution in Russia.

The French Revolution proclaimed the freedom of man and the citizen, the freedom of the individual. The October Revolution later made a step of fundamental significance in the movement of world history by proclaiming freedom and rights for the working people and the exploited. For us, the Soviet people, the connection between the French and Russian revolutions is indisputable. Both of them, each at its own stage, opened up new horizons for the whole of civilization.

Each has both its own identity and its own socioeconomic, political, and precisely international consequences. The first gave a powerful boost to the formation of a social system which, incorporating more and more countries, advanced civilization and progress with gigantic strides, through the crises, the ruthless competition, the exploitation, the expansion, through the tempestuous and inexorable acceleration of production forces, through the national and colonial wars and domination of backward peoples, while at the same time creating new spiritual and scientific values and developing in the course of the class struggle general democratic values.

The second one, just over 100 years later, became possible thanks to that progress, at the level of general world civilization already achieved. It was also a protest, an answer to the contradictions and defects that had come to light in the course of the development of the first one. It also gained an international character, and therefore it met with fierce resistance, just as the first one had at its birth. The further natural development of the new system turned out to be incomparably more difficult, and not only for subjective reasons, as a result of the crude mistakes and deviations from one's own principles. The balance of world forces was much less favorable to it than the situation at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries. It was confronted by a much more powerful system, and moreover one that in the event had far from exhausted its historic opportunities.

The desire to liquidate the new system was one of the causes of the emergence of Fascism and the war it unleashed. The desire is also to be found at the source of the cold war which could have brought the whole world to its end—universal catastrophe. Happily, the forces of self-preservation and reason came into their own in good time and led to a search for a consensus so civilization can survive and attain a new high, where values common to all mankind are the fundamental principle.

A new philosophical revolution was required for this, as was the case in the past. Two areas for reflection came to mind here. First, have we, the legatees of the great revolutions of the past, implemented to the full the rights and freedoms they proclaimed? Of course, mankind's present situation differs radically from the situation prevailing on the eve of the October Revolution, even more so at the end of the 18th century.

Over the years following the revolution our country has accomplished colossal and unprecedented forward breakthroughs. We now speak without mincing words about our history's difficult upheavals, about the tragedies that could have been avoided altogether, but nevertheless had to be experienced. You cannot alter history. We are grasping the fact that we have come to, as it were, lag behind ourselves in many things. We lag behind the very ideas for which our revolution, the world's first socialist revolution, was accomplished.

We have become aware that deformations of the principles upon which construction of a new type of society had begun in Lenin's time were permitted, that ideas of freedom, equality, and justice—which constitute the humanistic basis of a social revolution—had been distorted.

We have chosen a path of restructuring whose aim is a radical renewal of society and we quickly determine that we can only attain this aim through all-embracing and deep democratization, through an organic combination of socialism and democracy. This matter has turned out to be far more difficult and contradictory than was imagined at the outset, but it is making progress. The country is changing rapidly and irreversibly. The first USSR Congress of People's Deputies is very clear proof of this.

What is the essence of the radical reforms we have begun? If we abstract ourselves from details we can say this: The key to resolving the tasks of restructuring lies in overcoming man's alienation from ownership. This is the common denominator of all our measures for pulling down the administrative-command system and for transforming production relations. We are providing scope for the development of various forms of socialist ownership. We are placing at the service of the consumer the market, commodity-monetary relations, initiative, enterprise, and the ability to manage. In brief, we are turning the economy toward man and his material and spiritual needs.

The key to the success of restructuring lies in overcoming man's alienation from authority. This is the essence of the political reform: the return of sovereignty to the soviets, genuinely free, contested elections, the delivery of all social life from dogmas and prohibitions, glasnost, real accountability for executive organs, and independent courts.

Restructuring in the USSR is bringing us back to the undistorted values of socialism—democracy, the sovereignty of the people, social justice and human rights. Those are our reflections on how we handled the legacy of our own revolution, not only reflections, but conclusions and practical actions—the new policy. Alongside this, we are interpreting whether we have completely understood, in a timely manner, the lessons of the French Revolution and the society to which, in the main, it owes its origins.

What about the West? Has it drawn all the conclusions and have they always been in keeping with reality—about where the world has come to through fierce opposition to socialism? That is a topic for reflection for intellectuals. Does its policy in this respect correspond to the ideals of the French Revolution?

That is another interesting topic. "Conclusions" have been reached objectively, sometimes regardless of one's own will. The challenge of an alternative society which was presented in 1917—particularly after it had demonstrated its viability and might in routing Fascism—prompted capitalism to take more seriously the task of implementing the requirements engendered by the revolution in France, and even to borrow somewhat from what inspired the men of October.

This does not mean a reinterpretation of the essence of the historical processes of the 20th century. Look, for example, at how the West is reacting to our restructuring and to what is currently happening in other socialist countries. How many expectations are there, even among those who take a positive attitude to these processes, expectations that the socialist countries will return to the bosom of capitalism? How many illusions remain that only bourgeois society is the absolute and eternal truth? It would be all right if these were just theories, but we know for sure that there are also politicians who, guided by just such views, are counting on pushing socialism back.

Just in the last few days before my visit to France I read a lot in this regard in the world press, including the French press. Is it not similar concepts, albeit cruder in form, that led to wars? Are they not one of the sources of confrontation and the arms race?

No, it is not on this road that consensus should be sought in the movement toward a better world, to a peaceful period, to the European home. Freedom of choice is a principle for the existence of the world community that is universal in our age, and adaptation will have to be made to this. We are all faced here—I stress, all of us—with enormous problems. For the moment it can only be stated with satisfaction that, within the scope of the common European process and of the United Nations, the first attempts are being made to progress to their resolution. We consider the businesslike and all around examination of the human aspect of the European process, which has been begun at the conference in Paris and will be continued in Copenhagen and Moscow, to be a sign of the times. It follows from this that the problem of human rights and other questions of the humanitarian dimension arise in all places, and that, however much approaches to them might differ, we all have a definite community of aims in this.

In our time—and this is entirely justified—a state is judged according to whether it wishes to and whether it is able to create legislative and material possibilities enabling man, citizens, to feel free and equal among equals. The whole world comunity can be guaranteed against catastrophes if states are also guided in this sphere by generally recognized norms. Consequently, the search for consensus in relation to these norms and taking account of the existence of various socioeconomic and political systems is more pressing than ever before.

The second range of problems: In addition to human rights and the rights of peoples another colossal, vital, and at the same time, dramatic problem has arisen, that of ensuring the rights of humanity, the rights of the human race, to continued life, its rights to revive harmony with the rest of nature, its right to normal and genuinely human conditions for development. I think in this respect we are still at the very beginning of the path. The new historical epoch dictates new laws of social progress. The realities of our time compel us to reinterpret its very criteria. The development of material production cannot continue in its previous forms, placing the same burdens upon the environment in which we live. On the other hand, the humanization of society—however much we differ from one another from country to country—dictates a type of development that must have as its focus the individual and man's inherent strength.

The problem is a global one and needs the consensus of all mankind. Is this consensus possible? For the world remains divided, armed, and in conflict. Social contradictions are tearing it apart and the class war has not become a thing of the past. All that is so, yet, nonetheless, everything is different. The antagonisms between countries and groups of countries, between social and political forces, overlap. They overlap with the general clash between society and nature and the poverty of a huge proportion of mankind. Here is yet another topic for consideration.

We have entered an era when any progress should fit in with common human interests. That is probably the highest priority topic for all intellectuals, first and foremost for science. It is essential to seek, and seek together, common criteria for progress in the conditions of an unrestrainable scientific and technological revolution in the nuclear, and then, in the post-nuclear age. We must inevitably do this, for the alternative to this is general decline, the disintegration of world civilization, or even its destruction.

I would like to share some thoughts on this matter. First, it is increasingly clear that we do not have the right to go on putting our trust in uncontrolled development any longer. If we want to survive, if we hope to keep pace with the rapid growth in man's material forces, we have to learn somehow to administer this process together.

Second, it is now already clear that the customary, traditional understanding of progress cannot be projected into the 21st century. Moreover, history has convincingly shown that such a type of progress only intensifies unevenness in the enjoyment of wealth, both within individual

countries and in the world community. Generally speaking, the traditional technocratic approach is now taking a sharp turn against the very idea of progress and of the elevation of man. On the agenda is drawing up some kind of sensible needs of mankind with due account of resources, energy and raw materials, the demands of ecology and demography, and of course, the need to eliminate the rift that is threatening everyone between a small group of developed countries and dozens of others especially in the Third World.

Third, the new civilization, the formation of which has already begun, will not be a uniform monolith. On the contrary, its viability lies in its diverse and multifaceted nature, i.e. spiritual, national, social, political, and cultural. Herein lies the distinguishing feature of the integrity of the contemporary world, which will without doubt intensify from decade to decade. If so, then one of the first prerequisites of progress comes to lie in tolerance of a different way of thinking and of a different way of life. This is why an unconditional recognition of freedom of social and political choice by all people is essential. This has to become the univeral imperative of the era.

Fourth, clearly, in the course of an indefinitely long period of time, world development will find realization through coexistence, cooperation, and peaceful competition among states and socioeconomic systems. No one among them can claim the role of gravedigger of the others, unless it wants to commit suicide and bury all of mankind at the same time. I would like to lay special emphasis on this thought.

Fifth. The struggle for national, economic, and political independence and for social and political rights will not lead any of its participants to their goal under the present conditions if they ignore the grave realities of the nuclear age and wittingly refuse to seek peaceful, political ways of resolving contradictions and settling possible conflicts, or if they try to find a way out beyond the context of interests common to humanity, in confrontation with private and common interests. Those, it seems to me, are the most important postulates of the time in which it is our lot to live. An awareness of them, I repeat, requires intense thought, an active conscience, and the reexamination of set ideas. In short, new political thinking.

New times and a new epoch demand a new interpretation of the famous slogans of your revolution—freedom, equality, and fraternity. Having retained their historical spirit, they are being filled with a different content. Namely that the future of humanity is possible if it is recognized that the freedom and well-being of all is a condition for the well-being and freedom of every people and every person.

Ladies and gentlemen, one of the most important features of the present situation is the sharp increase in exactingness with regard to the quality of politics. This depends to a great extent on the academic knowledge and participation of intellectuals. What was once an elite layer of specialists is being transformed into a broad community of authoritative representatives of the intellect and culture with a keen perception of the polyphony of the world today who react acutely to its problems and concerns. At the same time, demands are growing for the social, including international, responsibility of intellectuals.

Lack of spirituality and anti-intellectualism are frightening. No less dangerous in our time is intellect deprived of a moral foundation. If it is not organically bound up with morality, contemporary science loses its human meaning. What is even more important and topical is for the strengthening of the moral basis of science to be reflected also in its connections with politics. The weakening or, even more, a break in any of the links in the unity of politics, science, and morality is fraught with unpredictable consequences for contemporary humankind. Politics, if you like, needs an intellectual content. It must constantly appeal to reason and to a creative basis, and this presupposes genuine democracy not just with regard to one's own people, but also in the international sphere. Moral politics respects the sovereign rights of all people, great and small. It helps to find optimal combinations of individual, collective, national and general human interests. The moral principles whose roots lie in a 1,000-year-old culture of human relations give politics the strength to cope with global dangers and strengthen faith in a better future for people.

Enormous beneficial influences are now brought to bear upon politics by such powerful manifestations of public morality as, for example, the response to the tragedy in Armenia. We recall that the French were among the first to rush to our aid. The Armenian community in France made its own large contribution. Of course, notions of good and evil change from age to age and currently they are far from identical, but never before have the many facets of mankind faced such an insistent need to find their common denominator. We hope that by developing the traditions of the past people of science, culture, and art in France and the Soviet Union will, in cooperation with each other, play a worthy role in the humanization of world politics and in the restructuring of the contemporary world based on this common denominator.

Ladies and gentlemen, for more than 300 years the cultures of the Russian and French people have been closely intertwined. Despite all the upturns and downturns in political and economic relations between the two countries, cultural links steadfastly played their role in bringing the two closer together and preventing divisions. The cultural bridge withstood the darkest years of the cold war but it has become unacceptably narrow. During the recent period I would say there has been a deceleration in the pace of our intellectual and cultural contacts.

A fairly narrow range of names, albeit famous ones, participate in them. Acquaintance with the intelligentsia's work is of a selective nature on both sides in our time. Unforgiveably little is known in the USSR and

France about their respective modern cultures. This is not a reproach. Such were the times. However, it is now time to open up to each other again in the intellectual sphere. This has, incidentally, been greatly promoted by the anniversary of the great French Revolution. It is being widely marked in our country with exhibitions, academic sessions, discussions, roundtables, and a flow of articles and books. There is abundant food for thought in all this, for philosophical interpretation not only of history but also of today's world.

Franco-Soviet cooperation is constructed on the primacy of true values and is also called upon to help to defend our people's spiritual health from the torrent of mass depersonalizing ersatz culture.

A very important area of our interaction is the exchange of students and contacts between young people. The young generation will have to rid itself of the enmity and distrust of past decades and prepare itself for life in the common European home. In light of this, the Franco-Soviet agreement on youth exchanges is a significant act. It will perhaps be precisely in the relations between the Soviet and French people that it will be possible to develop an exemplary model of cultural interaction within the framework of the common European home. France and the USSR would thereby make a major and unique contribution to the formation of a modern all-European policy.

We are convinced that the intelligentsia and young people of our countries can, by cooperating, do a great deal for a peaceful period in Europe's centuries-old history and for the realization of its great ideals—life, liberty, and the dignity of the individual.

Franco-Soviet intellectual interaction can become the creative nucleus of movement toward a philosophical and moral revolution of our era. When combined with a humanist and rational policy, and with the new political thinking, this spiritual revolution will also predetermine the nature of the new civilization, the threshold which we are approaching.

Thank you.

Gorbachev Remarks on Beijing Events

AU0507120589 Paris AFP in English 1145 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Excerpt] Paris, July 5 (AFP)—The massacre of pro-democracy protesters in China was a "tragic event", Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev said here Wednesday.

Mr. Gorbachev, in his most extensive remarks on the situation in China since the military crushed the student protest in June, stopped short of overtly criticising the Chinese Government for its handling of the unrest.

But in remarks to students and intellectuals at Paris' renowned Sorbonne University, the Soviet leader said that political changes such as those underway in China could have at times "terrible" effects. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Talks With French Intelligentsia

LD0507171389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1532 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Paris, 5 Jul (TASS)—Today Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet chairman, spoke to representatives of the French intelligentsia at the Parisian university, the Sorbonne. He answered questions from the audience. The idea of the "European home" is winning public support from increasingly broad circles in Europe, the Soviet leader said. A sort of consensus is arising on this question among politicians, the public, intellectuals and whole peoples, which gives grounds for believing in the reality of this idea.

Replying to a question about the borders of Europe, Mikhail Gorbachev said that his views on this coincide with the position of General de Gaulle: They should be from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The Soviet leader stressed that the striving which could be observed at times to overcome the division of Europe by "crowding out socialism" was unrealistic and dangerous, saying every country has the right to make its own choice. He gave a positive assessment to expanding cooperation between the EEC and the CEMA, noting that building a "European home" based on freedom of choice, mutual respect of peoples and cultures, and on the broad exchange of values was a realistically achievable task.

Replying to a question about the possibility of French-Soviet cooperation preventing and eliminating the aftermath of natural disasters. Mikhail Gorbachev said that attention has been paid to this problem during the talks. The possibility of natural disasters was brought about by whims of nature and the negative consequences of technical progress. Danger stems not only from nuclear weapons, but also from atomic power stations. An accident similar to the one at Chernobyl could occur in any country.

Mikhail Gorbachev stressed the importance of expanding Soviet-French dialogue in various spheres. He said that he had been accompanied to Paris by Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, and Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, adviser to the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman on military questions. He said they had interesting discussions in Paris with representatives of the French Armed Forces.

Touching on recent events in China, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed the importance of the most acute questions' being tackled on the basis of political dialogue between

the leadership and its people, the youth, and the intelligentsia. He noted that the Soviet side welcomed the trend toward the normalizaton of the situation in China, which will create the opportunity of continuing the search for solutions of those problems which led to the exacerbation of the situation.

He expressed the conviction that at the present time it was essential to combine the posts of CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet chairman to consolidate society to conduct the policy of restructuring. In this case, the leader of the party that proposed the policy of restructuring, receiving power through government bodies, has extra possibilities for implementing positive transformations.

Mitterrand Opens Joint News Conference

LD0507172489 Moscow TASS in English 1701 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Paris July 5 TASS—Important agreements were signed and guidelines for Soviet-French cooperation defined during Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to France, President Francois Mitterrand said today, opening a news conference of the two leaders in Paris.

The French president expressed satisfaction with the resumption of regular annual meetings between the leaders of the two nations. He stressed that in two days of talks they discussed a broad range of issues and analysed the situation in Europe and the world at large.

Mitterrand said that the Soviet and French sides displayed a political will to strengthen bilateral relations. He also noted that they both realised difficulties they were facing.

Gorbachev, Mitterrand News Conference

LD0507223889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1723 GMT 5 Jul 89

[News conference by USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and French President Francois Mitterrand on 5 July in Paris; Mitterrand, correspondents speak in French with superimposed Russian translation—recorded]

[Text] [Mitterrand] Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to start by saying a few words. Mr Mikhail Gorbachev and I have already held a news conference of this kind, several years ago, in 1985. So, in doing this we are not starting anything new. This is Mr and Mrs Gorbachev's second visit to France. Between these visits, I have been to the Soviet Union several times. We have practically regained the rhythm of annual visits on both sides. During the past 2 days—the visit will be continuing tomorrow, President Gorbachev will go to Strasbourg—anyway, during the past 2 days, we discussed many issues and talked for many hours. In addition, there have been talks between our prime minister and ministers on both sides. Agreements have been signed. Apart from these agreements, the guidelines for cooperation between the Soviet Union and France have been determined, with goodwill being displayed. We noted that such political goodwill was present all the time in our talks. We did not conceal the difficulties of the task confronting us, and we know the starting-points in Europe and throughout the world.

I will not add anything more. I consider it my duty to present to you Mikhail Gorbachev, to whom, after he has said a few words, you will be able to ask any questions of your choice. I, too, am at your disposal. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Thank you, Mr President. To begin with, I would like to use my notes and to continue the conversation that you began. First of all, I greet the large press representation that has been here during the visit. I hope that the president and I are not alone in valuing that cooperation with the press these days. I would like, nevertheless, to start my brief speech and, once again, to ask the French correspondents to convey greetings to the French people on the occasion of the bicentennial of the great revolution.

Our visit on the eve of the main date of that holiday underscores the respect of the Soviet people for the French people. In our country, in marking this jubilee, we view it also as a feature of further mutual familiarization and at the same time as a perception of certain truths which are not only of historical significance.

We are satisfied with the visit. I refer to the delegation which has been here with me at this time. The talks and contacts with Mr President Francois Mitterrand have justified our expectations.

Our dialogue was indeed at a high level, not in the diplomatic sense, but in the sense of its large-scale and substantive nature, its content, frankness, and degree of mutual understanding. What am I taking away from it? First and foremost is the confirmation of the fact that France and the USSR, their relations, retain their great potential in bilateral, European and international significance. I think that we both once again felt that the constantly developing dynamic nature of these relations is necessary not only for our countries and our peoples but also for Europe. It is necessary for the world. During our conversations with the president we saw that we both proceed from the premise that the moment through which Europe and the world are passing is a crucial one, with, I would say, not ordinary, unusual processes taking place that will determine both the near and distant future of the world. This requires a large-scale approach from politicians, and a high degree of understanding of their essence and significance. Doubt did not arise between the president and myself over the fact that the multiformity of development, both inside systems, and in states which belong to different systems, is a positive factor. They should be taken into account in policy with all the more prudence and attentiveness.

The processes seem to us to be developing in a positive direction. They are, however, complicated and fragile, susceptible to danger, destabilization and to disruption, which could cause vast damage not only to the corresponding countries but also to the whole peaceful development, primarily here on the continent of Europe where, indeed, they were born.

The present Soviet-French meeting strengthens the stability of the Helsinki process. I think that the president and I would not be immodest if we made such an assessment. It strengthens the positions reached as a result of the Vienna meetings. Confirmation has been given to the unchanging nature of the role of Soviet-French cooperation in the European process. This is due to the strength of tradition and the fact that both France and the USSR have been the initiators of several important joint ideas for Europe and of course the well-developed nature and great experience of dialogue at the summit level.

Our two countries have long formed two wings, as it were, of European history and civilization, particularly after, and under the influence of the French Revolution.

In our discussions the president and I touched upon regional problems. The discussion of these problems confirmed that our approaches and views have much in common regarding the nature of these problems and the means of solving them. This applies in particular to the Middle East, and Lebanon in particular, where the situation demands urgent and energetic efforts to prevent the worst. It would seem, however, that after many years of this tragic conflict, which has caused so many victims and destruction, it would be difficult to think up something worse. The president and I are of the same opinion that the Arab world is uniting and striving to settle the Lebanese crisis and we are ready to aid their efforts.

We believe that our talks these days in Paris will raise even higher the role of summit meetings in making bilateral relations more dynamic.

I have invited President Francois Mitterrand to visit the USSR. We hope that these meetings will also promote the development of bilateral relations, and the European processes. As far as bilateral relations are concerned—and that is naturally the central topic in the talks during the visit—here we conducted a major exchange of views and work on many questions both on the eve of the visit and at the concluding stage, involving ministers of foreign affairs and government representatives for economic matters. And, of no less importance, there was an exchange of views between our military departments. Incidentally, the information that we were given at the general meeting today from representatives of the military departments of the USSR and France shows that the degree and dynamics of these talks make it possible to rate them highly positively. We counted...

I think we signed 22 documents, although we intended to sign 21. We signed a declaration with the president. Over the last few days, we have sensed that the level and nature of the summit level dialogue reflects the sentiments and wishes of our two peoples, and this is a sentiment toward rapprochement and more friendly relations. This sentiment also exists among the French people, and we sensed this, although we had few opportunities for personal contacts and meetings. Nevertheless, we had them, and this gave us the opportunity to see this for ourselves.

[Unidentified correspondent] Thank you.

[Mitterrand] Go ahead.

[Potapov] Potapov, Soviet television. A question for Mr President [Mitterrand]: Mr President, on the eve of Mr Gorbachev's visit you approved in an interview with Soviet television the concept of a common European home. You said that if a home exists, it has to be furnished. In the course of your talks—and here is my question—did you set the impression that the business of furnishing this home has made some headway? After all, this is of no small importance for a home.

[Mitterrand] Yes, of course, Europe is not just the USSR and France. Today we are ony two of the many future co-owners of this pan-European home. That is an expression that Mr Gorbachev uses. I repeat the expression for the sake of convenience, to make things clearer, but it is a very fine idea. Yes, what we discussed should give us an opportunity to furnish our home. Much still remains to be done. I don't think that we are arranging the bedroom furniture once and for all. Can we now get to the kitchen, and have a snack in the kitchen? I don't know yet. It would be no bad thing. For the moment much, much work remains to be done. However, that is the main idea, although I could add, ladies and gentlemen, that the future common home is a home that will not necessarily be inhabited by those who live in the basement or just in the attic. It is a new concept, a popular concept. Many parties should take part—the whole of Europe. There are countries here that belong to the eastern alliance. There are countries that belong to the Atlantic alliance. There are neutral countries, and neutrality is widely varied. There are groupings and associations. There are groupings that bring together four or five countries. We need them all. It is also necessary to add that those groups that will be in our Europe create at their own level general rules for cohabitation. Without this the home will become absolute hell.

Therefore we must make general efforts to move toward some kind of system under which the future co-owners or owners will conduct themselves and feel at ease, gather together peacefully in the evening and sit down at the table, discuss issues at table and watch television—but in a common language. This is a huge undertaking and please remember we are only just beginning it.

[Bromberger] Dominque Bromberger of the TF-1 television program. Comrade Gorbachev said, in stages. I shall permit myself to note the specific example of two countries of central Europe—Poland and Hungary—where the process of democratization has at least been started. This process of democratization could probably lead to the Communist Party no longer being the dominant force. Is the Soviet Union ready to agree to such a state of affairs?

[Gorbachev] I want first of all not to agree with you that the process of democratization only encompasses two countries. It encompasses all countries. These changes have unfolded, or are unfolding and are under way to varying degrees, at varying paces and with varying profundity. I rather think that this is a natural process which will make it possible—if in this case we are speaking about the countries of socialist Europe—through these processes to arrive at a new quality in each country and to develop the potential residing in the socialist system, the socialist structure and in socialist democracy.

If you and I agreed that the construction of a common European home does not mean, and will not mean, the ousting of this or that nation, this or that system, or this or that way of implementing one's social choice, but on the contrary respecting and recognizing all values, cooperation and exchanges, with each remaining the same as he is, but at the same time changing too on the basis of contact, comparison and competition, adopting all that is best and what will improve life and the conditions of life in this home—if this is so, it would mean that each people would retain its freedom of choice. This is a central point. Unless we acknowledge it, it is impossible to expect anything good in the future in international relations. Therefore the way the Polish and Hungarian people will cope—we mentioned them—is their own matter. We have an attitude of great esteem for our friends both the Polish and the Hungarians.

[Unidentified correspondent] [Words indistinct] We have now listened to a Soviet correspondent, French correspondents, Czechoslovak correspondents and naturally perhaps there are some other representatives here.

[Second unidentified correspondent] I am from Germany.

[Unidentified speaker] Where are you from? Which Germany are you from, are you from the Federal Republic of Germany?

[Second unidentified speaker] Which magazine?

[Second unidentified correspondent] THE BERLIN magazine. I would like to ask President Gorbachev a question. I would also like to ask President Mitterrand to voice his view on this question. Mr President Gorbachev, during your recent visit to the FRG you voiced certain doubts with regard to the right of people to self-determination. Does this right belong exclusively to people or to their rulers. I would also like to know whether this gives the right to the German people to rise against the interests of the four friendly powers—I have in mind the Allies. Yes, we heard Gorbachev speaking on this question, although the topic was somewhat different. But let Mr Gorabchev answer.

[Gorbachev] I think that for you it is worthwhile to continue relations with these four peoples because in the way in which they have recently been developing and which make it possible for people not to feel bad in Europe, including in its center, where you, as I understand live. Hence, I ignore your provocative nuance in your question. Now I will speak to the point. No, I firmly adhere to the approach about which I spoke just now. The changes and the achievement of a new level of relations and the shift of international relations both in Europe and in the world will, naturally, proceed not in a kind of vacuum or in a specially thought out or created promised land. No, all this must take place on this sinful and real earth where we all live, work, and where we intend to live together. This means we must be realists for if we call in question the realities which have arisen, and by this we put in doubt the whole Helsinki process and the its continuation—the Vienna process, through which we reached the present stage and through which we intend to travel further in the interests of all people—this then would not be the pursuit in which all of us should be engaged.

In Europe we have much of what we received as a result of well-known events. Incidentally, this includes the initiators of these events and those who lived in Berlin, and originated matters renowed for their consequences. So history has dealt with that, and the world will change through our own influence and according to our cooperation. History will see to all questions within the framework of the creation of our common European home. Let us build this common European home. I invite you to do this.

[Mitterrand] The question was also put to me and I would like to say that it is a question of a legitimate desire for self-determination by everyone from both sides of Germany. Mr Gorbachev, however, noted that in reality there exist two Germanys with two different systems—economic, social, and political—belonging to different alliances. It is a question of sovereign states and the corresponding problems. In my opinion German leaders as a whole strive toward a situation whereby the process develops within a peaceful framework and does not give rise to new hotbeds of tension. In the final analysis, (?it is clear) that the choice of the German people (?will play) a decisive role. I would like to say that it is precisely a question of a choice regarding those problems which have to be solved. I would not permit myself to take up a position which is more imprudent than that which is taken up by the leaders of the two Germanys, being a patriot's patriot. Let us not hasten a history which has already left certain landmarks, as during World War II. Let us live in hope and take into account the current and binding realities.

The countries will show the necessary sense of responsibility.

[Person in hall] [words indistinct]

[Mitterrand] Wait, wait. We are still holding talks now between representatives of France and the Soviet Union. Please.

[Unidentified correspondent] Thank you, Mr President. The WASHINGTON POST. My question is to Mr Gorbachev. We have seen this week how Solidarity has become a very important element in the political life of Poland. Do you think that it will be useful at the present time to invite Lech Walesa or another Solidarity representative to Moscow to hold discussions? Would this be a stabilizing element? Secondly, I realize that it is a domestic question, but I would like to know how you would comment on Jaruzelski's decision not to put forward his candidacy for the office of president of Poland.

[Gorbachev] On the first part of the question: We maintain quite extensive links with the Polish Peoples Republic, its people, representatives of various political, public and cultural forces and these links are developing. They include more and more new people. They include representatives of new political institutions. Therefore, I do not see any obstacles for it to be possible for there to be within the framework of this developing process meetings with the organization which is recognized by the Polish people and which plays a real part today in the political process, including in the Polish Sejm, and which is today participating in the formation of the bodies, the system of bodies which would be in accord with the interests of this complicated stage of the development of this society so that it is in accord with the hopes of the Polish people.

That was the first part. What was the second? [indistinct remarks] Oh, yes. Well you know, the situation there developed in such a way that there were those who were insistent and strongly recommended General Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee, to be put forward as a candidate, or to give his agreement to be put forward, in any event. This question was discussed by the Polish friends in depth. That is their affair. I think, as far as I know Comrade Jaruzelski, a major politician, a very responsible person, of very high morality, he weighed everything before making this decision. Therefore, I trust him and there is nothing else I can say.

[Unidentified correspondent] A question to the two presidents. (?I would like to know) with regard to your analysis, President Gorbachev and President Mitterrand, were the results of this analysis the same or do they differ with regard to the situation in China. Another question for Gorbachev, do you not consider that there is a crisis of communism, going on in the world just as people used to speak about a crisis of capitalism in the world?

[Mitterrand] Well, you've asked me a question. Thank you for that. I'll answer very briefly by saying: As far as those people who are here are concerned, including those who are sitting at this table, the events in China cause regret. The movement which could have given China an opening into the outside world was a democratic movement and I think that I did not diverge in opinion with all of my interlocutors of the last several years. What is at issue in essence is that (?we) are witnessing a state of crisis in communism. [words indistinct] but nonetheless I give Mr Gorbachev the right to answer this question on his own behalf.

[Gorbachev] I see that the easiest questions are directed at me! With regard to China: At the meeting in the Sorbonne today I received a fairly detailed question, and tried to give a fairly detailed answer to it. I don't want to take up more of your time. I ask you to familiarize yourselves with that answer. I can only confirm it, perhaps using different words, but the idea will be the same.

Concerning the second part of the question, you see all generations, including those which have already gone to a different world, and those who are retiring from active life, and those who today carry responsibility on their shoulders, the main responsibility for the situation in this or that country, and those who are embarking—perhaps the latter less—all of the rest have heard a great many statements about crises in communism. You know, I would not agree with this. We are talking about a system of views which was not thought up in study rooms, which was not born in academic circles, but which arose as an ideology of a class which emerged onto the arena of social life, the working class. Now they want... [changes thought] attempts were made earlier to bury this system, proceeding from the premise that strictly speaking this working class is no longer there; it is different. It is not the same anymore. The premise is that the middle class is the main factor. But as soon as sharp turns come along, the working class shows its character and its position, and all politicians in any state discover that there is a working class, just as well-organized, just as resolute, when necessary, and able to defend its positions.

Because this working class is alive, its ideology is also alive. Incidentally, the interests of this working movement, of the working class are reflected both in social democracy and communist movement. These are two branches of working movement. As a communist, an individual, and someone from the working people's background, I am very glad that very serious and profound contacts have been developing over the few last years between communist and social democratic parties. After 1914 a new process started, which is still in progress. I welcome it and do what I can to promote the development of this process. For in the final analysis, the working class and the working people are the basis of socialist and communist parties.

Thus, one should speak, and it would be right to think, neither about a crisis of Marxism nor a crisis of communism, but one should speak about rejuvenating and revealing the essential charcteristics of this movement within the context of current enormous changes both in the world and in countries led by ruling communist parties. The things taking place in the Soviet Union are an example of that. If somebody thinks that we are giving up our values, that we are giving up socialism or people's power, this is a delusion. Everybody should understand this. We are making neither the secrets of the Spanish court, as the saying goes, nor those of the Kremlin or the Elysee Palace.

No, we are saying that we want to give socialism a second breath through democratization, glasnost, through returning the individual to political and economic process, by overcoming man's alienation from property, power and culture and by making the social process more dynamic. I am convinced that this is so but these are sharp turns. This is accompanied by great discussions. Naturally, some people see this as weakeness, a crisis and, on the whole, wish to dump it in the trashcan. Dumping this in the trashcan of history has already been done more than once. All this is a fact, but if one indulges in wishful thinking, one can lose one's way. Maybe a ballyhoo in the press is worth its while. Why not? The press has many genres, but I would ask the serious press, which tries to gain insight into current processes, to make use of my discourse.

[Unidentified speaker] You know, we will have the opportunity to speak to you all. We have only slightly over an hour at our disposal. I am saying that we have to alter the sequence. We will not be able to satisfy everyone. I heard someone mentioning the Middle East here? No? I know you personally, I see you for the first time. However, the French should not hijack this news conference.

[Unidentified correspondent] I am addressing my question to Mr Gorbachev. Thank you, Mr President. I would like to return to your last reply. Certainly you have repeatedly confirmed your devotion to democratization, generating great hopes among the Soviet intelligentsia inside your country. On the eve of your departure for France, the Union of Writers recommended publication of the works—the complete works—of Solzhenitzyn, especially "the Gulag Archipelago." I would like to know, Mr President Gorbachev, whether you, personally, are inclined to support such a decision or not, and whether you are prepared ultimateiy to permit, as it were, the rehabilitation of the writer Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] I will answer the first part of your question in this way. I have confidence in the opinion of our leaders of the writers' union, and clearly, their point of view merits attention. As for the second part, about rehabilitation, everything here is concrete. That's how the process will proceed on a concrete level.

[Mitterrand] A journalist from the Middle East has been trying all the time to speak. I wish to give him the floor. Go ahead. To be honest, I do not know him personally.

[(Nasrowin)] (Nasrowin) of the QATARI NEWS AGENCY. I would like to ask you both a question, Mr Presidents. Since 1986, Paris and Moscow have been calling for an international conference on the Middle East. You have no doubt discussed the matter during these 2 days. Can it be said that you have made a decision to undertake any practical steps to hold that conference after 3 years of consultations and contacts on the part of your respective two sides? I also would like to ask you to give an appraisal of the plan put forward by Israeli Prime Minister Shamir. Do you think that his plan might be a step that would facilitate the holding of an international conference, or, on the contrary, that it would only jeopardize the holding of it?

[Mitterrand] On the first question, we did discuss, on the whole, the situation in the Middle East. We recalled our common wish to convene an international conference in accordance with the processes that we both indicated in 1986. I think I am right in saying it was in 1986. So I can only confirm for you that, yes, we support such a step. The conference may include both the members of a permanent council, if they want that, and countries belonging to the region. Someone may refuse to take part in the conference, but we will insist on being heard.

As for the second question, Mr Shamir's plan, well, as you are very well-informed journalists, you know that Mr Shamir does not agree with an international conference. He has already given the answer.

[Gorbachev] I might say that I am able to agree with what the president said. Perhaps just a couple of words need to be added, however, because of the importance of the problem, and to be expressed on my own personal account, as it were. Certainly we consider that it is one of the old and very difficult international... yes, let us say, chronic regional conflicts, and it harbors tremendous danger within. I refer to tremendous danger not only to the region, but to the whole world as well. The fact that the problem featured in our discussions and exchanges is further confirmation of that. Mr President has certainly said, and that reflects our common understanding, that it is, nevertheless, necessary to seek approaches that would bring about an international conference. This is not to exclude the possibility of there being, within the framework of that process, both bilateral and trilateral talks and meetings, whatever you like.

All the same, it is precisely this. We hope that this idea is alive. One way or another we are nevertheless heading toward a situation in which all parties will be forced to recognize that this approach is sensible. I would like to stress that. This will be in the interests of the Arabs, the people of Palestine, and the interests of all states involved in the conflict. It will meet the security interests

of the State of Israel. I believe this is what we all want, and it will meet the interests of the whole world. As far as Mr Shamir's plan is concerned, I would support what Mr President said.

[Mitterrand] So as not to return to the main problems concerning this region of the world, I would like to remind you that a text was handed out to you concerning the joint USSR-French statement on Lebanon. This statement backs the efforts of the [Arab League] committee of three. It says that the USSR and France reaffirm their readiness to assist in every way possible in efforts to bring peace, and in particular within the context of the Security Council in connection with its entrusting of this mission to the UN secretary-general. Messrs Gorbachev and Mitterrand are convinced that Lebanon should remain a sovereign, independent, united, and territorially integral state and an equal and active member of the international community.

We only have a few minutes left. Go ahead, Madame [speaking to correspondent]. You are the only woman who is going to speak! Imagine! Who do you represent?

[Unidentified correspondent] One last question. After your meeting and talks, have new elements emerged in the disarmament field?

[Mitterrand] The enormous field of disarmament belongs as a whole to the authoritative talks between the USSR and the United States. At the same time, however, the European states and others, and this includes France, are also involved with this problem. At this level, however, the discussion primarily concerns disarmament in the sphere of conventional weapons. We talked about this. I cannot say that we introduced new elements of some kind, but we confirmed our readiness and desire to reach an agreement on conventional weapons. But we have our partners with whom we will have to confer. Thus it would be rather premature to give a definitive reply to your question. Talks are still under way.

Does any Soviet journalist want to speak, one who has not spoken yet?

[Unidentified correspondent] Mr President, since you are worried about not having enough questions, I shall ask you this question. My French colleagues and some Sovietologists have been warning the French public lately about the danger of being charmed by restructuring and its initiator, Gorbachev, the Moscow charmer. In your view, did the Soviet delegation manage to charm Paris, the Parisian public, the business circles and the intelligentsia? Thank you.

[Mitterrand] You know the press is free to express its points of view. You have heard assessments which perhaps you did not like in your everyday (?contacts), but I tolerate it and this is not a bad thing for democracy in France. I do not know if the papers will continue in the same spirit, but all the same, it would be better for them to write and speak in a different tone. As far as the way the Soviet delegation has behaved and the nature of our talks is concerned, well, I can say that what was predominant was the element of goodwill. That is not just my opinion, I am referring also to what was said by the foreign minister, the culture minister and those who were at the Sorbonne. It seems that Mr Gorbachev's speech was very well understood and very well received, by the representatives of the French intelligentsia. The most varied representatives of the most varied sciences and areas understood this speech. I think that such visits promote the great mutual understanding between us. Who do you represent?

Bernard Lecompte, L'EXPRESS. I would like to ask Gorbachev a question about himself. Mr President, the French people know you a little better than they did, but there are some aspects of your life which we do not know about. So my question is this: We know that you have a mother who is an Orthodox believer. Were you christened as a child?

[Gorbachev] Yes I was christened. I was christened. I think that this is quite normal. Have I answered your question? [recording apears to be edited at this point precluding identification of following speaker]

[Unidentified speaker] We have already given a reply about Lebanon. We talked about Lebanon, we adopted a statement, it will be distributed to you. Your question please.

[Unidentified correspondent] [name indistinct] You have just made a general statement about Lebanon. That is very good, but we would like to know what demarches you will undertake to help the Tripartite Committee to fulfill its task. That is one question. The second question is to Mr Gorbachev. The Soviet representative who went to Iraq and Syria, did he complete his mission with good results to facilitate a cease-fire in Lebanon?

[Mitterrand] On the first question, well, Madam, the fact that the USSR is displaying a desire and the readiness to restore peace, sovereignty and unity in Lebanon, these are already momentus facts. Our Arab partners should know about this. This is no small result of this visit and the same applies to France, also, which is a privileged partner in Lebanon in many things including in this. What measures? Well, give us the opportunity to work them out. In the meantime we support the mission of the Arab League. This is the first thing. We of course do not intend to replace those who work there, locally. [passage indistinct] Perhaps Gorbachev too, would like to add something.

[Gorbachev] I agree with the first part of the president's reasoning. It is in keeping with the spirit of our conversation on this question. As far as the second part is concerned, on the results of the mission, then you know, after all, the mission is also part of our efforts. However, the comrade who went—it was Comrade Bessmertnykh,

the deputy foreign minister—he went to Iraq and Syria and was authorized by the general secretary and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet to discuss a number of specific questions. After returning from France we will hear more detailed information. In any case, you can proceed from the fact that—as Mr President expressed it—we sympathize with the Lebanese people. We understand the tragic element of this problem and its possible serious consequences. Therefore, all of us will help to resolve the problem first and foremost in the interests of the Lebanese people and other peoples, too.

[Mitterrand] [Words indistinct] We have already been working for 75 minutes, but I am quite happy with this. It is only the time which is at issue. All questions are, of course, interesting. You asked for the floor already, a long time ago. You, what organization do you represent? What organization? Not you, not you! Thank you.

[Unidentified correspondent] DAILY EXPRESS, London. Mr Gorbachev, in the course of the visit you spoke about restructuring, new thinking, glasnost, and about the common European home. What will happen to all these concepts if you, personally, for particular reasons are unable to continue to implement them?

[Gorbachev] I think that these ideas are not due solely to Gorbachev. The societies in the European states and in the world alike have arrived at this turning point and realized the imperatives of the present time and this now concerns everyone. If this was not realized in public and political circles, among the intelligentsia of various countries—practically of all countries—these ideas which assume the shape of new thinking would hardly be able to receive and meet such support and their implementation in specific policies and in political and diplomatic steps would hardly have been started.

Therefore this process will live, since the people, peoples, understand the need to implement changes. But why have you gotten worried? Do you have information about my health, or what? [somebody talks in the background, then there is general laughter from the audience] Or is information going about in Great Britain that Gorbachev's days are numbered? I've just read that in an article in LE FIGARO. But that's not news. LE FIGARO, in the main, writes like that all the time. [more audience laughter] We know that everything is normal here. We know every publication... [changes thought] for whom it works...

[Mitterrand interrupting] But in any case, in any case—please, I beg of you. [voice tries interrupting in the audience]

[Gorbachev] Just a minute, just a minute.

[Mitterrand] In any case, our days are numbered, in any case. The problem is that we do not know [passage indistinct]

[(Minkin)] (?Aleksandr Minkin) from OGONEK magazine: Yesterday together with our president you both walked along the Champs Elysee, while in the evening millions of viewers saw this scene. Only the two of you walked together. There were neither diplomats nor journalists alongside. I think that the whole world would be happy to know what you were talking about on your own—if that's not too great a secret. That's a question to both presidents. [chuckling followed by general laughter]

[Mitterrand] It's very nice to finish by joking. But we were not walking along the Champs Elysee. You're mistaken. Second, we were walking in the park of the Elysee Palace, not far away, and the interpreters left us with the approach of a number of photographers. They moved away a distance of about .30 meters and we did not understand each other in splendid fashion and spoke in splendid fashion. [more laughter] [passage indistinct]

[Unidentified correspondent] Do you think that these destabilizing elements are being encouraged also by the United States? We do not know, for instance, your reaction to U.S. President Bush's proposal which was directed to the Soviet Union. This concerned the withdrawal of all your forces from Poland. What was your reaction to this?

[Mitterrand] You haven't said who you are.

[Correspondent] I represent the France-Soir Television program.

[Mitterrand] Please note, I'm not the only person here.

[Gorbachev] Well, first of all, when I have thought about possible manifestations of instability, and I have thought about them, I have been aware that if you understand all the complexity and profundity of the changes taking place, it is all normal and natural.

Let us recall the first half of the seventies when structural changes were taking place in Western countries in connection with the oil crisis. It was necessary to adapt to a new situation. Let us remember how many millions lost their jobs at that time and what battles there were in the Ruhr, in Britain's coal mines, and everywhere. These were elements of instability. At that time the capitalist system sought answers to the challenge of the times. It adapted. What positive things there are at the present time in this system are connected with those serious interpretations and quests. Not everything turned out sunny for many entrepreneurs. Many hundreds of them went bankrupt and replenished certain strata of the population. [as heard]

Changes are now under way in the socialist countries too. A decentralization of the economy is under way and there is, if one is speaking of the Soviet Union, a renunciation of the administrative-command system and a transition to a system of initiative based on economic independence, and a broadening of the rights

of production collectives. This is to say, a democratization of economic life is under way. Restructuring is under way regarding ownership. New forms of organizing the economy are coming to the surface, based on leasehold, cooperatives, and much else. I will not enumerate them. You see, simultaneously with the fact that the process of restructuring is under way, there is a certain danger that these processes of restructuring might break loose from our grip. What is needed, so to speak, is one thing goes away, and another has not yet arrived. This is precisely what is happening in the Soviet Union. This gives rise to many painful things. So that is what I'm talking about. If anyone wants to seek to profit at this time from these processes and take advantage of them, and to throw up any, so to speak, destabilizing slogans, let alone to allow any, any precipitate steps to occur—this would be serious for the whole situation. That's what I want to say.

You say that we have not responded to Mr Bush's proposal. Well, first of all, I think that Mr Bush still needs to respond to all our proposals. We are still waiting. So the process goes on. But I would say that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue was not halted even at the time when Mr Bush came into office in the first few months of his presidential term, and it embraced various forms, including personal contacts. These have been established with Mr Bush for a long time, and they are regularly maintained. We are endeavoring to conduct matters in such a way that they resemble propaganda moves as little as possible. (?We urged) former President Reagan to this in the past when attempts were being made on certain occasions to teach us lessons and to admonish us, or to make some kind of procurator's accusations against us. We rejected this right away and after that a truly fruitful dialogue began, which led to very interesting decisions, of which you are well aware.

For our part, we believe that it is not a matter of scoring points or propagandizing, but of truly understanding that we are coming out of a very complex cold war period, trammelled by stereotypes, mistrust, the stockpiling of arms, and confrontation, and all this must be overcome. To achieve this we must be both wise and very courageous. Therefore we will continue this policy, and as I have heard more than once from statements by the U.S. President, in their approaches to Soviet-U.S. relations there will be both continuity and capital growth, so to speak. We are sharing this formula, we are cooperating.

Perhaps our partners do not like everything that we are doing and I cannot say that we are in raptures about everything which is adopted by Mr Bush's administration. This is not, however, an obstacle for the dialogue, which is underway. It is realistic and I am confident that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue will continue. All of us are interested in this and Mr President and I considered that the—and incidentally Mr President spoke about this today at the meeting with you—that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue is a most important element of international relations. We cannot be lacking in responsibility—let me put it that way. And I believe that on the part of both the Soviet and U.S. leaderships, we must act in the interests of our two peoples, of the European people and the peoples of the whole world. So that we will openly discuss and tackle all the specific questions we have. And now, we have started to switch on and operate the mechanisms. The period of feeling one's way, so to speak, of the U.S. Administration has passed. And this process will now get back onto the normal track. Thank you.

[Mitterrand] I thank President Gorbachev for participating in the press conference. I thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I thank all those who asked questions. Goodbye. [applause]

Gorbachev-Mitterrand Statement on Lebanon

PM0607145589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 Jul 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Soviet-French Statement on Lebanon"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand expressed profound concern at the continuing crisis situation in Lebanon and the trials and tribulations of its population. They called for an immediate cease-fire and strict observance of it as an indispensable condition for the establishment of constructive inter-Lebanese dialogue with a view to restoring national accord and a peaceful tenor of life on the basis of a balance between the interests of all the Lebanese communities. They also believe that urgent measures must be adopted to ensure an effective end to arms deliveries to all the Lebanese groupings involved in the conflict.

Expressing their support for the mission of the Arab League tripartite committee on Lebanon, the USSR and France reaffirm their readiness to assist its peace-making efforts in every way, in particular within the framework of the Security Council in connection with the mission which it has entrusted to the UN secretary general.

M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand are convinced that Lebanon must remain a sovereign, independent, and united state, with its territorial integrity intact, and that it must remain an equal and active member of the international community.

Gorbachev, Rocard Hold Talks

PM0607121189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev Meets With French Premier M. Rocard"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev held talks with French Premier M. Rocard 5 July.

At the premier's request M.S. Gorbachev talked about the current extremely important and complex stage of restructuring in the Soviet Union and its prospects. He

particularly stressed the task facing the Soviet economy of creating an efficient economic mechanism capable of saturating the domestic market with goods—above all, goods that are in high demand—and radically improving the country's financial system.

Asking the Soviet leader with interest about specific ways of implementing economic reforms, M. Rocard wished restructuring success. In France, he stated, the most varied circles are hoping that it will strengthen confidence and stability in Europe and promote the mutual opening up of East and West to each other.

The discussion went on to focus on the problems of building a new Europe. While observing with interest the processes of West European integration, M.S. Gorbachev said, the Soviet Union at the same time is asking two questions: Will this lead to a greater militarization of Europe by pooling the military efforts of the EEC countries, and will the "single European market" of the 12 West European countries turn in on itself? The interlocutors agreed that joint efforts should be made to avoid such a turn of events. They agreed that the successful building of a new, peaceful Europe will largely depend on the talks currently under way in Geneva between the USSR and the United States on nuclear and space weapons and the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces and confidence-building measures in Europe.

M.S. Gorbachev noted that the U.S. side is displaying a tendency to delay the Geneva talks by referring to the "special" position of France and Britain with regard to nuclear weapons. Consequently, it is particularly important for us that France should be ready in principle, as it has previously stated, to join the nuclear disarmament process at a certain stage.

M. Rocard stated that "France will pursue an active and assertive policy on nuclear disarmament issues" if the Vienna talks resolve the issue of equilibrium and stability in conventional arms spheres and if the West Europeans' "fear inherited from the past of Soviet superiority in conventional arms" is wholly removed. Nuclear weapons are West Europe's response to Soviet military superiority in conventional weapons, he said. I think, the French premier added, that the Geneva talks will be moved forward in Vienna. France very much hopes that the Vienna talks will be a success.

Taking issue with his interlocutor, M.S. Gorbachev stressed that the "cold war" era, which is the main cause of continuing mutual fear, is, fortunately, receding into the past. We believe that it is up to the West to respond with regard to both nuclear and conventional arms. Everyone must now make their contribution to the common cause of disarmament and look to the future rather than to the past.

M. Rocard supported this opinion.

In conclusion, the premier expressed confidence that M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France will lend impetus to cooperation between the two countries for the sake of peace in Europe and throughout the world.

Gorbachev Lays Wreath at War Memorial

LD0607105389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by television correspondent Ye. Lukyanov]

[Excerpts] Today is the 2d day of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's official visit to France. Our special correspondent Ye. Lukyanov reports from Paris:

[Lukyanov] The day's program began with the laying of a wreath by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Arc de Triomphe in Place General de Gaulle. [passage omitted] [video shows cortege drawn up at the Arc de Triomphe; Gorbachev shown being greeted by Navereau; Gorbachev acknowledges banner, inspects guard of honor; group approaches the eternal flame, wreath is laid]

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was met by General Navereau, the military governor of Paris. Comrade Gorbachev approaches France's national banner and salutes it. The orchestra of the national guard plays the state anthems of the Soviet Union and the French Republic.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev inspects the guard of honor and moves toward the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. [passage omitted]

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev honored the memory of those who died for the freedom of France in a minute of silence.

Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva lays flowers at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Fanfares of glory to those who died on the battlefield are heard.

Then Comrade Gorbachev signs the gold book of honorary visitors to the Arc de Triomphe.

French veterans of the World War II and participants in the resistance movement have been invited to take part in the ceremony. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev greets them warmly. [passage omitted] The ceremony is ending. Comrade Gorbachev and the people accompanying him are going to the Paris City Hall. [video shows Gorbachev and group shown going back to their vehicles]

Gorbachev Visits Paris City Hall

LD0607113989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 5 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; correspondent's report from Paris]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [unidentified correspondent] Today's next important event was a visit to Paris's City Hall. [video shows various views of the Hotel de Ville]. [passage omitted] Beside the Paris City Hall building, the mayor of the French capital, Jacques Chirac is awaiting the Soviet leader. [video shows Chirac and his wife standing chatting on the red carpet; a shot of the crowd] [passage omitted]

Now the motorcade carrying the Soviet visitors is arriving in the square in front of Paris City Hall. [video shows cars arriving; shots of the crowd; someone shouts "Gorby! Gorby!"] The Parisians give a warm welcome to Mikhail Sergeyvich Gorbachev and his wife. The Soviet visitors are welcomed by the Mayor of Paris Jacques Chirac. [video shows Gorbachev emerging from his black limousine and shaking hands with the Chiracs; interpreter puts in a belated appearance, but seems to be redundant; Raisa appears and shakes hands with Madame Chirac; Chirac pretends to kiss Raisa's hand] Jacques Chirac invites the Soviet leader into the City Hall building. [Video shows "Gorby!" shouter holding a copy of Gorbachev's book "Perestroyka" in French]

City Hall staff attending the ceremony are introduced to the Soviet visitor. [video shows Gorbachev shaking hands with them] Mikhail Sergeyevich signed the distinguished visitor's book. Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva adds her signature to the book. Comrade Gorbachev, was joined in his visit to Paris City Hall by Comrades Shevardnadze, Yakovlev and other officials. [video shows Shevardnadze and Yakovlev in conversation with two other men]

[Gorbachev] I am glad to be here in Paris today. It is interesting to see the city and its people, the mood of celebration, and we are glad to share the joy here of the festivities. Of course I can convey through the mayor feelings of great respect for the inhabitants of the city and my very best wishes. [video shows Gorbachev and Chirac seated in conversation]

[Correspondent] During the conversation between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Jacques Chirac, Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva met with the wife of the mayor of Paris. So the visit by the Soviet visitors to Paris City Hall came to an end. As they left, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and his wife were once again given a warm welcome by Parisians. From here the convoy of vehicles sets off to the Sorbonne and the University of Paris. [video shows Raisa and Madame Chirac in the Hotel de Ville; the Gorbachevs and M. and Madame Chirac waving to onlookers on the steps; vehicles leaving for the Sorbonne]

Gorbachev, Chirac Meet Briefly

LD0607083989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1555 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] [No dateline as received]—After a festive reception in the Paris Town Hall, M.S. Gorbachev held a short conversation with Paris City Mayor Jacques Chirac.

Greeting each other, they recalled their substantive meeting 2 years ago. J. Chirac stressed that he follows the activity of Gorbachev and wishes his European policy success. Successes of that kind are the result of a breakthrough in the moods of people, M.S. Gorbachev noted. The world is evidently ripe for change. And for this reason, a policy which corresponds with the mood of people is developed.

The conversation was basically devoted to the problems of Europe. J. Chirac stated that his concept of Europe "from the Atlantic to the Ural's," and the concept of an "all-European home," can draw closer during time, to a more unified, richer, and more peaceful Europe.

M.S. Gorbachev supported this idea in principle, but pointed to the importance of an accurate conception of what such a "Europe" is. Some people, for example, dream of returning it to the borders of 1939. There is a great deal involved in this if one thinks about it.

He agreed with J. Chirac's idea that it is necessary to think of Europe, not in terms of developing westward, but in terms of it developing forward. Europe really does have the chance to progress toward a better future. It is not easy but the task is a real one. We are convinced of this during the present visit.

Disarmament should be the foundation for the construction of a new Europe. Here the partners in the conversation are agreed. The adaption of the economies, the political systems, and the lifestyle is the task capable of being resolved. All the more so since Europe possesses colossal advantages over other continents in the organization of its joint existence in a "common home".

If one formulates the question along the lines of: You become the same as us, or you change and we will wait, nothing will come of the construction of Europe. There are realities insofar as there are two systems with their values. And only by standing back from this is it possible to build something of a common nature. May contacts multiply at political and public levels, between military organizations, in the sphere of culture, and between capitals. May everything accumulated during the years of alienation and confrontation be removed. May everything positive come to light which the one wants to take from the other. But all this must occur voluntarily and on the basis of mutual respect.

It is necessary to proceed not from ideological aims and attachments, but from realities. May the exchange of ideas expand and new options for the resolution of

economic and social questions come to light. We don't know yet what will come of this. But one has to get on with the job, and not insist on one's own superiority, and especially not impose what is one's own.

The partners in the conversation agreed that there is something here to ponder

In conclusion, M.S. Gorbachev wished the Paris mayor and the activity of its leadership success.

Gorbachev, Georges Marchais Confer

LD0607090189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2305 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Paris, 6 Jul (TASS)—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev met French Communist Party leader Georges Marchais here on Wednesday.

Gorbachev spoke of his impressions of his visit to France and emphasized the importance of a political dialogue and diverse cooperation between the two great powers—the Soviet Union and France. This is in the interests of the two peoples and promotes all-round European cooperation, he said.

Mikhail Gorbachev described the progress of restructuring reforms in the Soviet Union. Georges Marchais, in his turn, spoke of the French Communists' solidarity with the Soviet Communist Party and wished success to restructuring.

The sides agreed to continue discussions between the Soviet and the French Communist Parties when a French Communist Party delegation led by Georges Marchais visits the USSR in September.

Taking part in the conversation, held in a friendly atmosphere, were: E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, CPSU Central Committee Members Ya. P. Ryabov and V.M. Falin, and M. Gremetz, member of the Politburo and secretary of the French Communist Party Central Committee.

Gorbachev, Mitterrand Hold Talks 6 Jul

LD0607094489 Moscow TASS in English 0853 GMT 06 Jul 89

[Text] Paris, July 6 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev began the third and concluding day of his official visit to France at 10 o'clock Paris time [0800 GMT]. At the Marigny Palace, he had his final meeting with President Francois Mitterrand.

Immediately after this meeting, Gorbachev heads for Orly Airport. He is to fly to Strasbourg to address the parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe.

Departure Ceremony Held at Orly

LD0607095189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0937 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Text] Paris, 6 Jul (TASS)—The solemn ceremony marking the end of M.S. Gorbachev's official 3-day visit to France has just begun at Orly Airport. A guard of honor was formed and the state anthems of the USSR and France were played. Hundreds of Parisians greeted the Soviet leader on the way to Orly and in the area around the airport, thus expressing their affection for the top-level visitor and their satisfaction with the results of the new Soviet-French dialogue.

Shevardnadze Cited on Results of Visit, Talks

PM0607124589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS correspondent report under the general heading: "Seeking Common Criteria for Progress"]

[Text] A TASS correspondent asked Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze to comment on the results of the visit. He said: M.S. Gorbachev had his first meeting with President Francois Mitterrand yesterday and, as is well known, this was a very important conversation on the most acute problems of the international situation and on questions linked with the European process and bilateral relations. A broad sphere of consensus was revealed here on many questions of the day. Meetings will continue at various levels today and tomorrow.

The signing of a series of agreements—economic, trade, scientific and technical, and cultural agreements and agreements on forming cultural centers in Paris and Moscow—and other documents has, E.A. Shevardnadze pointed out, been a concrete result of this visit. Thus, an unprecedented number of agreements has been signed in the course of one visit. Of course, this was preceded by a great amount of preparatory work on the part of all departments, notably the diplomatic department. The results are impressive. I must also mention the good atmosphere at the talks. That is why I can describe this visit without any exaggeration as a milestone in Soviet-French relations.

The Parisians, the minister said in conclusion, received M.S. Gorbachev in a markedly warm and pleasant fashion. Yesterday's meeting at Bastille Square, which, the minister joked, was the "taking of the Bastille," was particularly thrilling.

At the end of the day M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand held a press conference in the Elysee Palace.

Shevardnadze Calls Visit 'Milestone'

LD0507201689 Moscow TASS in English 1858 GMT 5 Jul 89

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Paris July 5 TASS—The signing of an unprecedented number of agreements in the economic, trade, scientific, technical and cultural spheres, on setting up cultural centres in Paris and Moscow and other documents is a specific outcome of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to France, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze told TASS today.

He said that Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand, during their first meeting on Tuesday, had a very important conversation on the most acute problems of the international situation and issues connected with European process and bilateral relations.

The discussion revealed an extensive sphere of agreement on many present-day issues. Meetings will be continued at various levels today and tomorrow.

The foreign minister described the results as "tangible." He also praised the good atmosphere surrounding the talks.

Shevardnadze said that the Soviet leader's visit could be described without exaggeration as a milestone event in Soviet-French relations.

Paris residents accorded Gorbachev a warm and kind welcome, the minister observed. Yesterday's meeting on Bastille Square was especially moving, he said.

Shevardnadze, Dumas Discuss Trade

LD0507224489 Moscow TASS in English 2208 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Paris July 5 TASS—Roland Dumas, minister of external relations, and Pierre Beregovoy, minister of economics, finances and budget, hosted a working luncheon today for Eduard Shevardnadze and Lev Voronin.

The luncheon was attended by prominent representatives of the French business community.

The sides had a substantive discussion of the present-day situation and prospects of developing Soviet-French relations in trade, economy, science and technology.

The ministers remarked in their brief speeches that the development of mutually beneficial and equitable cooperation among European nations in the economic sphere is laying a solid foundation for building a common European home the outlines of which are taking an increasingly specific shape.

It was noted with satisfaction that Soviet-French cooperation was actively spreading to such areas as space, aviation, television, power engineering, transport and computer technology, which reflects the enhanced trust in relations between the two countries.

Ministers Sign Series of Accords

LD0507171989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1625 GMT 5 Jul 89

["The Continuation of the Talks, the Results of the Visit are Summarized"—TASS headline]

[Text] Paris, 5 Jul (TASS)—In the afternoon the two delegations met, in their extended form, in the Elysee Palace. E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, L.A. Voronin, ministers of state R. Dumas and P. Beregovoy, and Minister of Defense J.P. Chevenement reported on the results of their working meetings.

M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand summarized the results of their work in the course of the visit.

At the conclusion of the talks the heads of state ceremonially signed a declaration on the principles for the development, and improvement of economic, industrial, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and France.

The members of the governments then signed a series of Soviet-French agreements.

Soviet-French Agreements Detailed

LD0507224189 Moscow TASS in English 2201 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Paris July 5 TASS—Several economic, trade, scientific, technical and cultural accords were signed in the French capital today as Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev is continuing his official visit to France.

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his French counterpart Roland Dumas signed inter-governmental agreements on cultural cooperation, on the establishment and terms for the operation of cultural centres in Moscow and Paris, on perfecting hotline communications between the Kremlin and the Elysee Palace, on youth exchanges and on cooperation in the field of state archives.

Representatives of the Soviet and French Governments signed a long-term programme of scientific, technical, economic and industrial cooperation in the agro-industrial complex through the year 2000, a protocol to the inter-governmental agreement on cooperation in the study and exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes of June 30, 1966, [as received] and several other important documents.

Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff, and Maurice Schmitt, chief of staff of the French armed Forces, signed an agreement between the two defence ministries on mutual contacts between the Armed Forces of the two nations in 1990-1991.

Yakovlev Meets With Giscard d'Estaing in Paris
LD0507230389 Moscow TASS in English 2002 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Paris July 5 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, who is staying in Paris in connection with Gorbachev's official visit, met former French President Valery Giscard d'Estaing, chairman of the Foreign Relations Commission of the French National Assembly and chairman of the Union for French Democracy party (UDF) in Paris today.

They discussed urgent security and disarmament issues, ways of building a common European home and questions of world development.

They paid great attention to the course of restructuring and democratisation in the Soviet Union and prospects of renovation of Soviet society.

Latin America & Caribbean

20 Soviet Fisherman Injured in Lima Bus Bombing
LD0607102889 Moscow TASS in English 0940 GMT 7 Jul 89

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kotov]

[Text] Lima July 6 TASS—Terrorists planted a bomb beneath a bus carrying some 50 Soviet fishermen here. The resulting explosion severely injured 20 fishermen and a bus driver. Seventeen people were hospitalised. Four incurred leg and arm fractures and other injuries. Peruvian doctors told TASS that the injuries are not likely to be fatal. The blast destroyed the bus, damaged several other cars and smashed windows in neighbouring houses. The criminals managed to escape.

No terrorist organisations claimed responsibility for the attack.

In keeping with tradition, Soviet fishermen operating in the Pacific Ocean call at Peruvian ports to change crews and make repairs. They often go into the city for shopping. This time, 52 people from the Vladimir [word indistinct] fishing trawler that sailed from Kaliningrad, the Bykovo trawler from Murmansk and [word indistinct] the repair and substitute team of the Kaliningrad [words indistinct] a bus excursion to the Peruvian capital in the morning. It seems that the terrorists kept watch on their bus throughout its itinerary. The bomb was exploded when the fishermen were in the bus waiting for some of others who were late. [passage indistinct]

Nicaraguan Air Commander Arrives on Visit 27 Jun
PM2806130989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Colonel Xavier Pechardo, commander of the Republic of Nicaragua Air Force and Air Defense Forces, arrived in the Soviet Union 27 June on an official visit at the invitation of Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, USSR deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Air Force.

The guest was welcomed at Sheremetyevo Airport by Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov and other generals and officers of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Minister Plenipotentiary C. Lopez, counselor at the Republic of Nicaragua Embassy in the USSR, was among the welcoming party.

Supreme Soviet Meets 6 Jul; Ministers Appointed
LD0607090389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Text] A regular session of the USSR Supreme Soviet opened in the Kremlin at 1000 this morning. Deputies are examining nominations submitted by the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers for the country's government posts. These nominations have been examined in relevant committees and commissions of the chambers.

First to be examined was the nomination of Vladimir Makarovich Velichko for the post of minister of heavy machine building. He was given the floor. He spoke about the development program of one of the most important branches of the national economy and ways of overcoming shortcomings which hinders the improvement of Soviet machine building. Deputies Lukin, (Kotelevskiy), Manko, and others voiced their opinions on the candidate for the ministerial post.

Deputies appointed comrade Velichko by an absolute majority of votes to the post of USSR minister of heavy machine building.

A proposal was submitted to appoint Mikhail Ivanovich Shchadov to the post of USSR minister of the coal industry. Addressing the deputies, he spoke in detail, not only about production problems but also on questions of ecology, housing construction, water supplies to mining settlements, and house-building. The nomination was supported from the session platform by deputies Tsarevskiy, Tsigelnikov, Mikheyev, Pivovaroy, and others.

Then the floor was given to Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. He said that he is firmly convinced that comrade Shchadov is the man who should head the Ministry of the Coal Industry. The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers touched upon a number of questions raised by deputies connected with the difficult and hard work of coal miners. The new minister has a lot to do in order to solve the social problems of workers in the industry. These questions require a very serious attitude indeed. Comrade Shchadov was appointed by the USSR Supreme Soviet to the post of the minister of the USSR coal industry.

Yazov Approved After Deputies' Questions
PM0507154789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jul 89 First Edition pp 1,3

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA special correspondent: "Ministers Being Put to the Test"]

[Text] The Kremlin—Moscow's recent period of hot weather noticeably cooled on Monday [3 July], giving place to fresher, rainy weather. But in the USSR Supreme Soviet sessions hall the atmosphere is still heated, so both the deputies and—primarily, of course,—the candidates for high posts in the government are finding it hot in both the literal and metaphorical sense. The events at the session, which in the first days of its work were something unusual and out of the ordinary for all of us, now seem perfectly normal. What is more, we feel amazed and indignant at the way in which we have been so passive and indifferent to our fate and the fate of the country for so many years, decades even, and wonder why we were so indifferent as to who held the reins of power and upon whom the development of our economy, science, and culture and ultimately our well-being depended.

We remember how the leaders of many ministries and departments were strongly criticized at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. That criticism was well founded. The economy and social policy have reached deadlock—in many respects not without the participation of these ministries. To emerge from this crisis, there must be fundamental changes in the structure of the country's management and there must be people capable of leading perestroyka and putting decisions into practice.

On 3 July the session discussed the question of appointing Army General D. Yazov to the post of USSR defense minister. Hardly had he ascended the rostrum before deputies came up one after the other with notes containing questions. An endless stream of questions—written and verbal—were asked virtually the entire time he was on the rostrum. All in all, as the army general said, he received more than 400 questions from deputies. This fact alone shows that there are no members of the Supreme Soviet who are indifferent to the problems of the country's defense or the processes taking place in the Armed Forces. The discussion at the session was as severe and exacting as it was precisely for this reason.

At the start of his speech Army General D. Yazov briefly described the main functions of the Ministry of Defense.

Then he proceeded to answer deputies' questions. Listening to these questions, you felt sure that the people who now make up the Supreme Soviet have indeed resolved to assume full responsibility for matters in the country and for its future. The range of their interests is extremely broad: From the progress made by perestroyka in the Army and Navy to the fate of specific people; from problems connected with nuclear weapons tests or the transition to a professional army to questions of "bullying" and other non-regulation relations. A whole series of notes from deputies from the Baltic republics, Moldavia, and Georgia contained questions connected with the possibility of servicemen doing service in the territory in which they were born.

"I ask all the comrades to consider the situation," Army General D. Yazov said. "If every serviceman were to do service in the territory of the republic in which he was born, the question arises: Who will serve in the Western, Central, Northern, and Southern groups of forces? Who

will serve in the Strategic Rocket Forces, the Air Forces, and, finally, in the Northern and Pacific fleets?... Stating the issue in this way seems wrong to me."

Another question for the candidate for the post of USSR defense minister: Is it possible to release students on active military service? Answering this question, the army general gave precise information on how many students are currently in the Armed Forces and the positions they hold. He said that releasing this category of military servicemen would have a negative impact on the combat readiness of the Army and Navy. His answer was convincing, but despite this many deputies were dissatisfied with his response and raised this problem repeatedly in their speeches. Jumping ahead, I will say that M. Gorbachev has promised to return to this question and look into it more thoroughly.

Many deputies were concerned as to whether the reduction in numbers of army and navy personnel and the number of arms is in keeping with the tension that still exists in the world? It is, Army General D. Yazov confidently replied. This reduction must be made, otherwise we could become prisoners of our own weapons.

A group of questions was connected with the issue of new Armed Forces regulations. The army general told the Supreme Soviet that these regulations were drawn up on the basis of changes in our military doctrine and recommendations made at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. They will be published in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA for nationwide discussion and, first and foremost, for discussion throughout the Army.

The discussion of the nomination for the post of USSR defense minister lasted 3 hours. It was with great concern that deputies A. Genchev, Ye. Gayer, S. Kalashnikov, Ye. Auelbekov, N. Tutov, and many others spoke of unresolved problems in the work of the USSR Defense Ministry, the still slow pace of perestroyka in the Armed Forces, the poor social protection for military servicemen, the need to objectively assess the level of troops' combat readiness, and also the effectiveness of material expenditure on the upkeep of the Army. Speakers were also concerned by the fate of officers and warrant officers released from the Armed Forces as a result of cuts. The opinions of many deputies were expressed in the speech by V. Advadze, director of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] State Planning Committee [Gosplan] Research Institute of Economics, Planning, and Management of the National Economy. I think, he said, that we are unanimous on one point: Namely, that our Army, particularly its permanent cadres and officer corps, needs to see a sharp improvement in living and working conditions not only during service but particularly when people retire. Everything must be done to sharply improve these conditions.

As a kind of appendix to this speech, a letter was read to the session from a group of veterans—representatives of the Russian-speaking population in Lithuania—who related the conditions in which they have had to live since being released from the Army.

Deputies pointed out that the USSR Ministry of Defense must have a real concept of perestroyka the Armed Forces—a real concept, not just something on paper—that would enhance the authority of the Army and Navy and their combat readiness.

But there were also some flaws, in my opinion. For example, one deputy touched on the problem of interethnic relations in his speech in a very tactless way, which immediately prompted rightful indignation from an Armenian representative. Speaking of flaws, I am also thinking of the emotional speech at the very beginning of this session from Lieutenant Colonel V. Podziruk, deputy from Ivanovskiy National-Territorial Okrug. Noting that in army conditions many negative phenomena, such as cronyism, bureaucracy, ostentation, and deception, are becoming hypertrophied and that combat ability is often weakened by the uncontrolled burgeoning of staffs, he spoke very sharply and, in my view, unjustly of the role of political workers in the Armed Forces and the institution of political bodies as outmoded. The pointed appraisal of this claim made by V. Yarin, a deputy from Nizhniy Tagil, was perfectly justified.

The practical, political qualities of Army General D. Yazov and his wealth of experience as a military commander were discussed at the USSR Supreme Soviet session by V. Lapygin, chairman of the Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security, and Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev.

M. Gorbachev summed up the results of the discussion. Army General D. Yazov was appointed USSR defense minister by a majority vote.

At the end of the session, I went up to Dmitriy Timofeyevich and, congratulating him on his appointment to this high office on behalf of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers, briefly interviewed him.

[Kosarev] Which questions, in your view, among those raised during the discussion are the most important and conceptual for the organizational development of the Armed Forces?

[Yazov] The main question, in my opinion, was the one about how to prevent a deterioration in the combat readiness and combat ability of the Army and Navy in light of the reduction of 500,000 Armed Forces personnel. And if we are talking about questions of a social nature, about people, then one of the main questions is, of course, the question of how to accomodate and establish those who will be released in connection with the cut in the Armed Forces. This is a source of concern to all—the Ministry of Defense and the Supreme Soviet. The problem is a difficult one, as it concerns not people in general but specific human lives. But I am confident that we will be able to resolve it.

[Kosarev] Do you think that today's Supreme Soviet session and the discussion of your nomination will contribute to perestroyka in the Armed Forces?

[Yazov] Certainly it will. But many people who talk about perestroyka only have a very vague idea as to what is meant by perestroyka in the Army and Navy and what purpose it is supposed to serve. I believe that first and foremost it must enhance combat readiness. Working on this basis, we will do everything possible to ensure that perestroyka moves ahead at a rapid pace, as required by the times. [Yazov ends]

I also asked him the following question, not without a smile, as they say: Will those military servicemen who criticized the defense minister at today's session and opposed his nomination not suffer? They will continue their service as before, Army General D. Yazov replied. No one is thinking of taking reprisals against them because of their criticism. After all, in many respects that criticism was just.

I hope that my account of today's USSR Supreme Soviet work will help you to sense the atmosphere of exactingness and principle which is becoming the norm for our new parliament. We are witnessing the birth of a completely new relationship between executive authority and legislative authority. The essence of this relationship lies in equal rights, trust, and mutual responsibility.

Further Ministerial Appointments Reported

LD0507173189 Moscow TASS in English 1657 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent reporting from the Kremlin:

Even though members of the USSR Supreme Soviet have agreed not to eulogize candidates to government positions but make only critical remarks, the arrangement is not always kept.

In the afternoon today, for instance, the Supreme Soviet considered the appointment of Vladimir Shimko to the post of minister of radio industry.

the 51-year-old candidate headed the ministry in 1987-1988, but then was transferred to the party Central Committee. The deputies who knew what Shimko had accomplished during this short tenure as minister praised his performance and welcomed his return to the ministry.

This candidate was confirmed by the vast majority of votes (out of 385 deputies who took part in the vote, only four were against and with five abstentions).

The absolute majority of deputies supported another candidate, Nikolay Kotlyar, 54, reappointing him minister of fisheries, the post he held since 1987.

The critical tone that the two candidates evaded was transferred to Vladimir Chirskov, 54, proposed to the post of minister of the construction of oil and gas industry enterprises.

The work of the ministry has been subjected to strong criticisms lately. Today, parliamentarians blamed Chirskov, who has held the post for the past four years, for his ministry's failure to observe ecological standards, especially in building oil and gas pipelines in Siberia and the north, where the environment is extremely vulnerable.

A question was raised about the ministry's possible responsibility for the recent accident in Bashkiriya when a leak of fuel from a pipeline resulted in an explosion that claimed numerous lives.

The question was settled when the deputies heard an opinion of parliamentary committees and commissions of the chambers which noted during the preliminary discussion of the candidacy that one could speak about the causes of the disaster only after the completion of a government commission's work.

Chirskov was confirmed in the position by the majority of votes.

Igor Koksanov, 61, minister of ship-building industry since last year, retained his job, too.

Vladimir Brezhnev, 58, was reappointed minister of transport construction, the job he has held since 1985. Among questions asked was whether he was a relation of Leonid Brezhnev.

The candidate explained that his mother and the mother of the late Soviet leader were sisters. This information, naturally, did not affect the deputies' stance.

Supreme Soviet Hears Report on Fighter Crash

LD0507161589 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent reporting from the Kremlin:

Members of the USSR Supreme Soviet demanded today at the close of the sitting that the defence minister report about the incident involving a Soviet fighter-plane, MiG-23m, which crashed on Belgian territory.

Colonel-General Bronislav Omelichev, first deputy chief of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff, who was present at the session, made the report.

He said, specifically, that the shut-down of the afterburner resulted in a sharp drop of thrust, speed and height of the flight, which the pilot took for an engine breakdown and bailed out.

The plane then flew without boosting until spending all fuel.

Asked when the command learned about the incident, Omelichev said that the fact was reported after 1.5 minutes, but the location of the aircraft became known only after dispatches by Western news agencies.

In an exchange of views that followed the report, deputies expressed concern over the incident and drew the Defence Ministry's attention to the fact that such situations were fraught with unpredictable consequences.

It was decided to hear additional information upon the completion of the work of a commission that will investigate the incident.

Leaders Attend Mourning Watch for Gromyko

LD0507180389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow today bade farewell to Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, a major political and state leader of the country and a personal pensioner of all-union importance.

In the Red Banner Hall of the Central House of the Soviet Army a coffin containing the body of the deceased was set on a pedestal amid flowers. Scarlet cushions bore the awards which marked Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko's many years of work in state posts, including two Hammer-and-Sickle gold medals of Hero of Socialist Labor, seven Orders of Lenin, the Orders of the Red Banner of Labor and the Badge of Honor, and USSR medals.

There were many wreaths in the hall, including a wreath from the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers.

The first watch of mourning was performed by members of the government commission in charge of organizing the funeral. The guard of honor included Comrades Vorotnikov, Zaykov, Ryzhkov, Slyunkov, Chebrikov, Biryukova, Vlasov, Lukyanov, Razumovskiy, Yazov, and Baklanov.

The leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state expressed their deep condolences to the relatives and near ones of Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko.

Muscovites came to the Red Banner Hall to pay tribute of profound respect to the deceased.

A watch of mourning by the coffin was also performed by the chairmen of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet; deputy chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers; USSR people's deputies; ministers; leaders of party, local soviet, and public organizations; and military chiefs.

The heads of the diplomatic missions of foreign countries accredited to the USSR came to honor the memory of the deceased.

At Novodevichye Cemetery, where Andrey Andreyevich has been buried, a meeting of mourning was held.

Gromyko Funeral, Burial Place Described

LD0507165789 Moscow TASS in English 1558 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—The funeral of Andrey Gromyko, prominent Soviet statesman and political leader, was held in Moscow today.

Gromyko's coffin was installed at the Central House of Soviet Army in Moscow. Members of the government commission for arranging the funeral were the first to stand in the guard of honour. Leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state expressed condolences to Gromyko's family and relatives.

Heads of foreign diplomatic missions, accredited in the Soviet Union, came to the Central Army House to pay their last respects to Andrey Gromyko.

Gromyko was buried at the Novodevichye Cemetery where a funeral meeting was held.

The USSR Supreme Soviet is receiving many telegrams which say that such a prominent statesman as Andrey Gromyko should be buried on the Red Square. Anatoliy Lukyanov, first vice-president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, told the parliament's session today that in a personal conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev and members of the government commission for arranging the funeral, Gromyko's widow and all his family had wished that Gromyko was buried at the Novodevichye Cemetery. Their request was met.

Supreme Soviet Reviews Candidates 28 Jun

Voronin Fields Questions

LD2806063689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0600 GMT on 28 June begins a live relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet session. The announcer reports that Gorbachev is chairing the morning session. Gorbachev declares the morning session of the joint session open and talks about the discussions of the proposed government members. He goes on to Voronin's candidacy for first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and invites Voronin to take the floor, asking deputies to ask questions.

At 0603 GMT, Deputy Yermolayev from Omsk Oblast asks a question about public transport. Voronin answers the question, promising to examine all issues. Gorbachev intervenes to clarify the question.

At 0607 GMT, another deputy from Krasnoyarsk Kray asks about gasoline shortages. Voronin answers, quoting figures to support his view.

At 0610 GMT, a deputy asks about shortages of tractors and similar equipment. Gorbachev urges her to save the question for Silayev.

At 0611 GMT, a deputy from Tajikistan asks about the lack of material and technical resources to help clear up after the earthquake in that republic. Voronin cites figures for the resources supplied after the quake.

At 0613 GMT, a deputy from Neryungri asks about transport problems in the coal industry. Voronin talks about measures taken to solve the problem and promises an effective mechanism.

At 0614 GMT, Deputy Babchenko from Dnepropetrovsk asks about nonfulfillment of government decisions on consumer goods. Voronin promises that he will make it his job to ensure that decisions are fulfilled.

Wins Appointment; Maslyukov Considered
LD2806064489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0600 GMT on 28 June continues its live relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

At 0616 GMT, Gorbachev calls for a vote on Voronin's appointment. Eleven vote against, out of 427 present. Abstentions are not given. Gorbachev declares Voronin appointed.

At 0618 GMT, Gorbachev reads out a message calling for simplification of the selection process, by considering only those candidates where there is doubt. Gorbachev says he is against denying deputies the chance to put serious questions to candidates.

At 0621 GMT, Gorbachev calls for speeches to be kept short. He goes on to Maslyukov's nomination and calls him to the floor. Maslyukov sets out his view of Gosplan [State Planning Committee], urging that it should be open to suggestions on its work. He talks about Gosplan's projects for the second half of the year: taxation, development of the socialist market, balancing the budget, anti-inflationary measures and others, including planning integral scientific programs, regional development problems, and the convertibility of the ruble.

At 0626 GMT, Gorbachev invites questions. Deputy Makhkamov from Dushanbe criticizes employment policies in the past for not differentiating between regions. Maslyukov talks about a plan worked out by Gosplan for promoting employment in Uzbekistan.

At 0631 GMT, a deputy asks a question about grain farming. Gorbachev recalls his own time in Stavropol. Maslyukov agrees to examine the issue.

At 0632 GMT, Velikhov asks when Gosplan intends to submit the plan for 1990.

At 0633 GMT, a deputy from Kiev asks about the balance between wages and goods produced. Maslyukov refers to his work in the defense industry.

At 0634 GMT, a deputy speaking for the Soviet Women's Committee asks about plans to divert resources from military spending to other areas, including social problems within the Army itself. The deputy asks: How much is "a proportion of resources"?

Maslyukov Responds to Questions
LD2806070689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0600 GMT on 28 June continues its live relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet Session in Moscow.

At 0636 GMT, Maslyukov says he agrees that there are social problems in the Army, with housing shortages and the like. Investment for social conditions in the Army must not be reduced.

At 0638 GMT, Deputy Engver from Izhevsk asks about regional financial autonomy and how exchanges between regions and republics will work. Maslyukov urges detailed study of the issue.

At 0641 GMT, another deputy asks about failures in supplies in the railway system. Maslyukov answers.

At 0644 GMT, Maslyukov answers a question from a deputy about the taxation system and science at higher education establishments.

At 0646 GMT, a deputy criticizes the absence of a strong social policy and asks Maslyukov about his proposals. Maslyukov promises specific figures to show how the standard of living is progressing; each ministry will have its own specific program in the social sphere.

At 0649 GMT, Gorbachev announces his departure to meet Honecker.

At 0650 GMT, a deputy who works in the light industry asks why workers are brought in from Vietnam when there are more than enough people in Soviet Central Asia to do the jobs. Maslyukov is in favor of using Soviet workers too.

At 0652 GMT, a deputy criticizes the absence of a cultural policy and inadequate restoration of old monuments. Maslyukov rejects criticism of industrialization, but agrees with regrets regarding the fate of monuments.

At 0655 GMT, a deputy from Krasnodar asks about measures to help the countryside.

Discusses Schools, Water Resources

LD2806074489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continues its live relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

At 0700 GMT, a woman deputy asks about the transfer of industry to the central Asian regions in line with demographic changes in the country. She asks who is in charge of this policy.

Maslyukov denies that anyone is obliged to move anywhere to fulfill the needs of industry. Demographic policy, he says, falls within the competence of republican authorities.

At 0705 GMT, (Kopsikova), another woman deputy, brings up the subject of falling school numbers in the countryside. She wants to know Gosplan's position on pension provision.

Maslyukov says the closure of small schools in the countryside must be put right. There can be schools for 50 pupils, he says. "Unfortunately the level of education of our people is lagging behind that of other countries." The level of equipment of schools should also be improved.

At 0710 GMT, Deputy Amanova from the Turkmen SSR says a lot of money has been spent on water engineering in her republic but not very much on social needs.

Maslyukov says the amount of money spent on water engineering has decreased throughout the country and it has been spent on social needs, but much of this has been soaked up by national disasters such as Chernobyl, and the Armenian earthquake. Money generated locally through financial autonomy belongs to the localities, he says.

At 0715 GMT, Deputy Bocharov asks about cooperation within Gosplan between engineers and economists. Maslyukov provides appropriate figures.

At 0717 GMT, a deputy from Kurgan-Tyube asks about the allocation of resources to that area.

Maslyukov says the construction of a railway in that area is being studied. All the projects for the 13th 5-year plan will be presented to the Supreme Soviet for consideration. The government's approach to the excavation of ancient antiquities is based on preserving the country's cultural heritage.

At 0720 GMT, the chairman interrupts to say that he is now accepting written questions to save time.

Deputy Yakubov from Astrakhan asks about popular discussion of the RSFSR budget. Maslyukov says there has been great interest in this; Vorotnikov is chairing a commission to discuss an increase in the budget allocation to individual areas of the RSFSR.

At 0725 GMT, another question concerns the rational distribution of water.

At 0726 GMT, a Latvian deputy asks about normative documents for republican financial autonomy.

At 0727 GMT, a member of the Ecology Committee asks about the ecological situation at resorts.

At 0728 GMT, a question is asked about acceleration in the economy: Maslyukov says some areas of engineering, information science, and other sections should be accelerated. He supports the concentration of forces in specific areas.

At 0730 GMT, a question deals with social development plans for individual enterprises. Maslyukov says they should be worked out by the enterprises themselves.

Gives Views on Agriculture, Defense

LD2806084289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continues its live relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

At 0732 GMT, Deputy Nikolayev from Bashkiriya asks about disparities in foodstuffs provision throughout the country, questioning "where is the social justice?" Maslyukov responds that the Ministry of Trade is working on this subject, and states: "I am in favor of justice in this respect".

At 0734 GMT, a question is asked about farm debts in low-productivity areas and what level of investment is expected in the near future. Maslyukov says that appropriate bodies have studied the position in specific areas and the commission for foodstuffs must look at it.

At 0737 GMT, it is asked to what extent farm activity planning is viable. It is stated that planning in this regard is the affair of the localities.

At 0740 GMT; Maslyukov is asked what will be the economic effect of the conversion of the defense industry? "If by conversion you mean disarmament, that is not taking place and will not in the near future", says Maslyukov. He refers to new NATO weapons under development. "One can speak of the partial use of the capacities of the defense industry to tackle the most acute social problems of our national economy," he says. All documents on conversion will be presented to the Supreme Soviet by the end of the year.

At 0744 GMT, the chairman says he has notes saying that time must be used more economically. It is suggested that there should be 15 minutes for replying to questions.

At 0745 GMT, a question is posed concerning rumors about the burial of nuclear waste from other countries in the USSR. Maslyukov says he believes this to be nonsense. He says there is a need for the output of additional medical goods.

At 0749 GMT, a series of individual questions are posed concerning minor regional issues and local concern about them. A subsequent question is asked about the provision of computers to schools. Maslyukov says there will not be a problem here.

At 0753 GMT, a deputy says that the investment policy has neglected the Tashauz Oblast of Turkmenia.

At 0754 GMT, a deputy from the Baltics says the republics there are part of a transit route for goods and are suffering ecologically as a result. Maslyukov says that every republic can be used as a thoroughfare for transport and if it believes it has suffered from pollution as a result it can apply to the center for compensation.

At 0756 GMT, Deputy Matviyenko from Leningrad complains about the deficit of certain goods in the city.

At 0800 GMT, the chairman declares a break for 20 minutes.

Maslyukov Elected

LD2806095489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0830 GMT resumes its live relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

Questions to Maslyukov continue.

At 0832 GMT, a question is asked about the money invested in pipeline construction. Maslyukov expresses the belief that all the money saved by the conversion of defense industries should be paid into a central budget.

At 0835 GMT, Maslyukov is asked what he thinks about rewards for innovators. He responds that the law on inventions provides the answer to this. Likewise, the law on pollution provides the answer to what should happen to polluters.

At 0838 GMT, the subject of foodstuffs deficits is considerd. It is noted that a large amount of sugar is imported from Cuba. Domestic production should be kept at the present level. If less sugar were used on domestic alcohol production, then there would be enough for all.

At 0840 GMT, Maslyukov responds to a question: "the growth in salaries should in no case be ahead of the growth in labor productivity". Tax reform and the introduction of a new tax system are the answer to the present economic situation, he says.

At 0846 GMT, the sale of alcohol and narcotics is considered and a deputy asks: do not tobacco and alcohol belong to the category of narcotics? Maslyukov answers that there must be a reduction in the amount of home-brewing.

At 0850 GMT, Malyukov is asked if the construction of children's installations will be paid for by central funds. He answer yes. How will the question of deficits in children's clothing be resolved, he is asked.

At 0853 GMT, a deputy asks about financial autonomy in the area of culture: Cinemas, circuses, etc can operate under financial autonomy, Maslyukov says.

At 0855 GMT, questions to Maslyukov end.

At 0856 GMT the chairman again suggests that questions should be submitted in written form. He gives the floor to Deputy Akayev.

At 0900 GMT, Akayev says he supports Maslyukov's candidature for chairman of USSR Gosplan. He speaks about industrial production, saying that it must be controlled on an all-union level, not just locally.

At 0903 GMT, a deputy speaks about the preservation and restoration of the city of Novgorod. he also speaks about the ecological situation there which has been affected by the overuse of fertilizers.

At 0906 GMT, a deputy expresses the belief that industrial management must take place at both the local and central levels.

At 0908 GMT, Deputy Likhanov talks about the problems of invalid and retarded children. Funds should be allocated for the purchase of buses by institutions to cater to these problems, he says.

At 0910 GMT, the chairman proposes that a vote be taken on the election of Maslyukov as first deputy chairman of USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of Gosplan. He is elected "by a majority". six votes against, 12 abstentions.

Abalkin Questioned

LD2806110589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continues its live relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

At 0914 GMT, the floor is given to academician Abalkin. He says that the gap between state income and expenditure is R100 billions. If the budget deficit is not eliminated, he says, there will always be lines for washing powder and soap.

At 0920 GMT, Abalkin is asked if he has anything to do with the fact that the economy is in ruins since he has been involved with it for a long time. He replies that he cannot shrug off personal responsibility totally and that he believes totally in economic restructuring.

At 0922 GMT, Abalkin stresses his belief in the economic autonomy of the republics. "This would be a major step forward" he says, adding that it is the function of the union republics to formulate plans for consumer goods production.

At 0925 GMT, Abalkin is asked about his attitude toward separating the USSR Central Bank from the Council of Ministers. He answers that the main thing is to adopt serious law on banks that would confirm their independence and sovereignty.

At 0930 GMT, Abalkin is asked what questions must be resolved first and foremost in the country's agrarian sector. Abalkin responds: "I believe that issues connected with implementing economic reform in the agrarian sector must also form part of the circle of problems that will be tackled by the state subcommission for economic reform because it is my opinion that we have allowed a very serious imbalance by conducting one reform in industry and construction, as it were, and another economic reform in the agroindustrial sector. The economy is an integral whole. There must be common principles for reform throughout the national economy. I think the main thing now for the agrarian sector—this is also my opinion—is not to increase allocations for its development but real changes in economic relations and to grant freedom of choice in forms of economic management, in forms of ownership, in spheres of the application of labor, without there being any force in this and without any attempts to find a single universal model for all regions and all conditions: setting people free. Setting people free."

At 0933 GMT, Abalkin says that the state budget deficit can be cut in two ways: by increasing income and by reducing expenditure.

At 0934 GMT, a deputy asks Abalkin when there can be a freely convertible ruble? "No earlier" than "6 or 7 years," he replies. "At approximately that time, perhaps a little later, taking into account all the complexities of the issue, one might talk about the full convertibility of the ruble. We need to start now, right now, on partial convertibility, in its various kinds," he affirms.

At 0936 GMT, Abalkin is asked for his views on ensuring full employment: It is a very serious problem, he says, for which there are a number of causes, he states: "The problem of employment will now be connected with three very major factors being in operation. The first one, discussed in detail here, is the lack of employment in many regions where the population growth rate is high; this is the first problem. A second problem is beginning to arise. In the next few years it will begin to assume an exceptional significance. It is the fact that manpower resources will be laid of completely from the sphere of material production. By the year 2000, these will amount to between 12 million and 15 million people. We absolutely need to render redundant between 12 million and 15 million people and to find employment for them, to ensure that there is an area in which they are trained and that there are vacancies in the sphere of services and so forth. This ought to be a matter for a colossal state program. There is, finally, the third problem that will develop further. It is the distribution of manpower resources—the redistribution from the state into the cooperative sector and the sector of individual work activities and the sector of family peasant farms. These are fundamentally new processes and trends in the sphere of employment and these are not traditional for our country, requiring very major decisions. I think we shall have to deal with this very seriously, through, above all, the committee on labor and social matters."

At 0945 GMT, Abalkin states that over the past few years, the country's economic situation has been deteriorating month by month. He says he believes that there should be the opportunity for the Supreme Soviet to hold a vote of confidence in the government and also for the government to resign.

At 0950 GMT, Abalkin is asked if the country's economy can be raised without an enhancement of discipline. This is impossible, says Abalkin.

At 0955 GMT, Abalkin is asked if one speak of the superiority of the collective farm system with the current foodstuffs problems. Abalkin talks about the "sad history" of collective farms.

At 1000 GMT, the chairman declares another break, and announces that questioning will continue afterwards. He asks whether a vote should be taken now. Deputies say no. He therefore declares a break until 1600 Moscow time (1200 GMT) when consideration of Abalkin's candidature as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers will resume.

Abalkin, Belousov Endorsed

LD2806205289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1739 GMT on 28 June begins a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet evening session in Moscow. Gorbachev chairs the joint session. The composition of the government is being discussed.

At 1740 GMT, Abalkin reads out and replies to a question on reducing foreign aid. He says aid will continue. He goes on to praise financial autonomy in the economy and says time will be needed to change people's way of thinking. standards must be raised throughout society.

The eastern shore of the Caspian Sea should be used for resorts, say Turkmenian deputies. Abalkin says there should be local financial initiative here.

At 1748 GMT, on the question of what urgent measures he would like to see taken, Abalkin says that this is a question for Supreme Soviet bodies not individuals. A scientific review of agrarian policy in the past has shown the need for change in economic relations in the countryside; without this no investment will produce improvements.

At 1752 GMT, deputy Sazonov poses an indistinct question from the hall. Abalkin tells of repressions of economists in the past

At 1754 GMT, Abalkin says there is not time for long-term experiments at individual enterprises.

At 1755 GMT, a female deputy from Lithuania expresses doubts about Abalkin's attitude to regional autonomy and objects to his support for generally applied principles.

At 1802 GMT, Deputy Fedorov expresses support for Abalkin. He complains that the Council of Ministers is an executive body but it assumes legislative powers. This is impermissible. Deputies should keep an eye on Abalkin's authoritarian tendencies.

At 1805 GMT, a deputy complains about Abalkin's disrespectful attitude to Soviet agriculture. Loss-making farms should not be disolved; the losses are artificially created.

At 1812 GMT, Deputy (Sevastyok) expresses support for Abalkin. He proposes that creative collectives should be free to earn foreign currency abroad.

At 1814 GMT, Deputy Travkin takes issue with a previous speaker for criticizing abalkin who is an honorable man.

At 1817 GMT, there is indistinct shouting fromm the hall. Gorbachev calls for quiet. Someone apologizes.

At 1818 GMT, a deputy supports Abalkin but criticizes him for not supporting more radical reforms on territorial autonomy. the deputy calls for more devolution from the center. Only cosmetic measures are being proposed.

At 1822 GMT, Deputy Kanarovskaya from Moldavia supports Abalkin. She praises the views of economist Kondratyev, repressed by Stalin, who wanted more rights for peasants. The promised improvements in the countryside are not forthcoming as decisions are not being implemented. War widow's pensions should be reviewed.

At 1830 GMT, Gorbachev proposes moving the vote. Number of votes for Abalkin not given; 10 against; 11 abstentions. Abalkin is appointed deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers. Applause.

At 1832 GMT, Gorbachev introduces Belousov's candidacy and asks him to speak.

At 1833 GMT, Belousov says funds for defense industries should be reallocated for new equipment. There should be more cooperation with science. Reliability of equipment should be improved. Some capacities should be converted to civilian uses.

At 1841 GMT, Gorbachev asks for questions for Belousov.

At 1842 GMT, a deputy complains about low quality of equipment and training. Belousov agrees with the need for more consultation with users.

At 1844 GMT, Belousov replies to a question on financial discipline. Gorbachev calls for the question to be answered to the point. It is decided that questions will now be in written form.

At 1846 Belousov expresses confidence in the consumer goods program for converted defense capacities. He says military allocations will be discussed by the Supreme Soviet.

A question calls for more new equipment. He says work is under way on producing personal computers for schools.

A question touches on the use of peaceful atomic explosions in permafrost areas. Another question is asked on agricultural machinery produced by the defense complex.

Belousov says the agro-industrial complex is the focus of everybody's attention. Medical equipment will be looked after by the defense industry. Soviet achievements in aicraft field were shown at the Bourget show, despite the crash.

There is a question on employing invalids. They should be provided with work. Questions are asked on setting up an anti-nuclear committee, on measures to involve defense in producing consumet goods, on archangel defense factories, which also produce agricultural equipment.

A question is asked on compensation to Simipalatinsk residents. Yazov has already answered it. Measures should be taken and the situation rectified.

At 1905 GMT, the proportion of defense industry in gross national output, figures given. It is lower than in the United States. There is the issue of costs of equipment.

Gorbachev suggests that Belousov should answer specific questions tete-a-tete. It is agreed upon.

At 1909 GMT, a deputy says that the defense complex is beyond Supreme Soviet control. There are comparisons with the U.S. Congress. The military should be accountable to the corresponding commission of deputies. In general, he supports the candidate.

At 1915 GMT, Deputy Blayev says that construction materials should be taken care of. The defense industry should be involved in this.

At 1920 GMT, Deputy Lisitskiy supports Belousov.

At 1923 GMT, Deputy Lapygin from the committee for defense and state security maintains that his committee is answerable to the Supreme Soviet. He describes the program for their work and the composition of the committees. The military represent only 32.5 percent. He supports Belousov.

At 1931 GMT, Gorbachev makes remarks on the proceedings. The Defense Council is yet to be formed.

At 1933 GMT, there is a vote on Belousov. There are two against, 12 abstentions. Belousov is endorsed.

At 1934 GMT, Gorbachev says: "There is a proposal to organize our work and to allocate our time on Thursday and Friday [29 and 30 June] in the following way, if you do not mind. With this we are taking into account the views that are already arriving but have not yet taken the shape of our working schedule, so to speak. The first half of the day we will work here, at the sessions and the second half we will work in committees and commissions, both on Thursday and Friday. Do you agree, comrades? No need to put this to the vote? No. Agreed, then."

At 1935 GMT, the recording of the session ends.

Supreme Soviet Resumes Review 29 Jun

Biryukova Queried as Candidate

LD2906151489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 29 June begins broadcasting a recorded relay of proceedings at the 29 June USSR Supreme Soviet session. Gorbachev, chairing the session, discusses procedural matters, and at 1406 GMT introduces the question of Biryukova's candidacy as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and invites here to speak.

At 1407 Biryukova begins by replying to questions submitted in writing on improvements to pensions and the proposed new law on pensions. A question on removing women from night shift working meets with her support. Biryukova is asked about reducing prices of children's goods and increasing aid to large families. She says that the government is reviewing various measures. A deputy asks about the establishment of specialized clinics. Biryukova explains where the government plans to open new clinics. In reply to a request for more holidays for women workers, Biryukova says that a new law on vacations is being prepared. She then replies to questions about school equipment. Biryukova expresses support for Yagodin as education head, and denies ever having any other opinion. She goes on to tell how much money is allocated for physical culture and sports.

At 1422 a question is asked about the allocation of private cars for sale to various groups of workers, followed by a request that earning ceilings be removed for various groups of pensioners. Future plans for resorts are discussed. Biryukova says that she does not think the health service should take them over. More organizations should be given the right to build resorts.

Questioning Continues

LD2906155789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Russian at 1428 GMT continues its recorded relay of today's USSR Supreme Soviet session proceedings with a deputy's question on trade unions that have lost their social significance. Biryukova says that trade unions still have a vast amount of work to do as they defend workers rights. In reply to a deputy's complaint that rural dwellers pay higher prices for goods, Biryukova says that discriminatory measures must be abolished.

At 1431 GMT, Gorbachev asks whether it is time to put the candidacy to the vote. Deputies indicate that they have more questions. Gorbachev discusses how much more time to allocate, and proposes that candidates be given 30 minutes to answer questions. This is put to the vote. A period of 1 hour is proposed, and this is voted on. This receives almost the same number of votes. A compromise of 45 minutes is accepted by Gorbachev, which he attributes to Yeltsin.

At 1441 GMT, Biryukova replies to questions on individual local problems, costs of hospital treatments, production of disposable syringes, and training of medical and education specialists for rural areas from among rural youth. Asked if she smokes, Biryukova says no. She gives her ideas for the development of the Black Sea coast, saying that it should be a resort zone, not one for polluting industries.

At 1450 GMT, a deputy expresses sympathy for Biryukova being the only woman in the government replying to so many questions from men. The consumer goods'

production plan is discussed, and Biryukova says that output must be increased rapidly; Uzbekistan is to share in increased production demands as it has the potential.

At 1455 GMT, Gorbachev thanks Biryukova. He asks if there are other speakers on the candidcay, and says that they will be allowed up to 5 minutes each to speak.

At 1456 GMT, deputy Kiselev expresses support for Biryukova.

At 1457 GMT, deputy Semukha calls for better diagnostic equipment, and more medicines. He proposes buying more from abroad. He complains there are few facilities to improve the life of people in wheelchairs.

At 1505 GMT, deputy Neumyvakin supports Biryukova. He asks about provision for invalids. further as available.

Deputies Voice Support

LD2906165489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1515 GMT continues its recorded relay of the proceedings of the 29 June USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

A Deputy supports Biryukova and recalls that she has done much to help textile workers in Kirgizia; raw material prices should be raised so that Kirgizia does not remain a raw material appendage of the Baltic republics' textile industries.

Deputy Pukhova of the Women's Committee complains that more women do night shifts than men. Measures must be taken to reduce night shifts for women. There should be longer maternity leave; more attention should be paid to women's rights.

Deputy Abdullayeva expresses support for Biryukova and says that 3 million women work in substandard conditions.

Deputy Stepanov is then invited to speak. He returns to the question of disposable syringes. He suggests they could be made from glass.

At 1540 GMT, Gorbachev puts Biryukova's candidacy to the vote. Those against :68. Number of abstentions indistinct.

A Deputy calls for absentee deputies to be disciplined. Gorbachev asks officials to propose measures. Another deputy recalls that Lenin suggested that absentees should not receive their expenses.

At 1545 GMT, Deputy Medvedev suggests ways of saving time in the questioning of candidates by grouping questions in advance. A different deputy called Medvedev says that many deputies are absent for very good reasons and so should not be disciplined as long as they report in advance.

Some one else calls for deputies to have physical fitness facilities to keep in shape so that they will not be absent for reasons of ill-health.

At 1550 GMT, Gorbachev makes further procedural proposals on submitting questions. Another deputy submits proposals on procedures for submitting questions; ministers should be given time to reply to questions.

Deputy Gryazin says that deputies are responsible to their electors for their absence from sessions. Gorbachev says that question time should be used more effectively.

At 1559 GMT, Gorbachev announces a 20 minute interval.

Gusev Nominated as Deputy Premier

LD2906172589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 29 June resumes its recorded relay of the proceedings at the 29 June USSR Supreme Soviet Session in Moscow.

Lukyanov introduces Gusev, who is being nominated for deputy premier for the chemical and timber complex. Gusev gives details of plans for the chemical industry.

At 1606 GMT, Gusev goes on to answer questions on antipollution measures in a given region; the organization of the industry; shortages of paper; waste in the timber industry; and the construction of a blagoveshchensk works, opposed by the local population in Bashkiria because Japanese equipment is being installed.

At 1615 GMT, Gusev starts answering written questions from deputies on waste, ecological worries and the reconciling of ecological and economic demands, plans for technological lines to utilize waste, total annual figures for timber procurement, the need for polymer pipes for gas—production figures for USSR and the United States of America, excessive timber-cutting on Sakhalin, and the lack of construction timber for the northern regions. Gusev says the Budenovskiy plant is being modernized with the help of John Brown engineering to produce polymer for pipes. Gusev says the problem of gas provision in the countryside can be resolved in 2 years. He also refers briefly to a state committee for timber to the damage caused by forest fires and to the extent of forest depletion. Gusev then replies to worries about primitive pulp mills in Sakhalin—the plants are to be cleaned up or closed.

At 1640 GMT, Lukyanov says his time is up and questions from the floor to Gusev are taken.

A deputy asks why chemical plants are being built in the Odessa area? The siting of the plants is being studied, Gusev replies.

Another deputy complains about lack of paint for machine-builders.

Election Approved

LD2906183489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1645 GMT on 29 June continues its recorded relay of the proceedings of the 29 June USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

A deputy complains that Gusev has been talking too much about plans, but what has he done in the last 3 years? Gusev defends himself by saying plans have mostly been fulfilled, although shortages are growing. Gusev says he is not satisfied with the work of the timber-chemical complex.

A deputy from Altay Kray wants gas pipes for the countryside now, using pipes for a canceled plant.

At 1651 GMT, an official from a commission that discussed the Gusev nomination mounts the rostrum. He sets out the debate about the Gusev nomination that took place in the commission. The vote in the commission was 25 for; 6 against; and 22 abstentions.

A woman deputy complains about the chemical and timber industry's record on the environment. She says Gusev must be stricter on this. Another deputy complains about the location of chemical plants.

Deputy Yudin says he wants a specific plan of action and says he can't vote for Gusev.

Deputy Rakhimov speaks in favor of the Gusev nomination. Let's not turn Bashkiria into a rubbish dump for plant no one else wants, he says.

Another deputy defends Gusev saying he's only had 3 years.

At 1717 GMT, Deputy Vezirov says he wants investments in Azerbaijan to be wisely utilized and backs Gusev. Deputy Ogarok gives the Uzbek point of view. He also backs Gusev.

At 1733 GMT, Ryzhkov notes that there have been different opinions about Gusev. The chemical industry is a crucial and difficult one. He says he was struck by the speech on Bashkiria—but the Bashkirians themselves were very keen on the plant in the first place. Ryzhkov says he believes Gusev is qualified for the job.

At 1730 GMT, Lukyanov puts the Gusev nomination to the vote. The result: 378 for; 35 against; and 32 abstentions. Gusev is elected. Applause.

Lukyanov then reads out the times and locations of committee meetings later. He says tomorrow's session will be from 1000 to 1400 (0600-1000 GMT).

At 1737 GMT, the recorded relay ends.

Commentator Igor Zorin sums up the days proceedings and the program ends at 1739 GMT.

Supreme Soviet Session 30 Jun Detailed

Doguzhiyev, Shevardnadze Confirmed

LD3006152589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1401 GMT on 30 June begins broadcasting a recorded relay of proceedings at the 30 June USSR Supreme Soviet Session in the Kremlin, introduced by Igor Zorin.

At 1401 GMT, Gorbachev, who is chairing the morning session, greets the deputies. He says that the session will discuss the appointment of Vitaliy Doguzhiyev as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

At 1405 GMT, Doguzhiyev speaks briefly. He comments on the situation in Gomel Oblast after the Chernbobyl accident. He then answers a question about industrial accidents. He comments about the work of nuclear power stations.

At 1411 GMT, Gorbachev asks who is in favor of confirming Doguzhiyev's appointment.

At 1413 GMT, Gorbachev announces that Doguzhiyev has been confirmed in his post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

At 1414 GMT, Gorbachev introduces the question of confirming Eduard Shevardnadze as foreign minister of the USSR.

At 1415 GMT, Gorbachev asks if there are any questions. He then takes the vote on Shevardnadze's appointment. Shevardnadze is unanimously confirmed as foreign minister.

At 1419 GMT, Gorbachev introduces the question of confirming Mikhail Shkabardnya as manager of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers.

At 1420 GMT, Shkabardnya speaks briefly about his tasks, about efforts to provide efficient equipment for the work of Supreme Soviet sessions.

At 1424 GMT, Deputy Medvedev asks about the existence of a structure for interaction between various government ministries. Shkabardnya says as yet there does not exist a clear-cut mechanism for this. He speaks of the importance of ensuring a suitable mechanism for the economic reform.

At 1427 GMT, Deputy Nazarov asks about ensuring that decisions of the Council of Ministers are carried out.

At 1429 GMT, Deputy Denisov asks a question.

At 1430 GMT, Gorbachev takes the vote. Shkabardnya is confirmed in his post.

At 1431 GMT, Gorbachev introduces the question of confirming Kamentsev in his post as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

At 1432 GMT, Kamentsev speaks briefly about the Soviet Union's share of foreign trade and gives figures for various types of exports. Kamentsev then answers questions about the right to act independently on the foreign market and about free convertibility of the ruble. The recorded relay continues.

Kamentsev, Gubarev, Filshin Speak

[LD3006160989]

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1450 GMT on 30 June continues its recorded relay of the 30 June proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin. In answer to a question Kamentsev says foreign deals are already conducted on a competitive basis. He speaks of the need to purchase medicines abroad and gives some figures for these purchases in recent years.

Kamentsev then answers question about free economic zones. He says that two special development areas—one in the Far East and one in the Saimaa Vyborg area—exist at present.

Kamentsev goes on to speak against currency privileges for workers abroad. He says the currency must be backed up by goods that can be purchased. He speaks of grain purchases abroad and gives figures. Kamentsev speaks of cases of financial abuses and swindling in the Ministry of the Fishing Industry's network of firms. He speaks of the Sushkov case.

At 1512 GMT, Gorbachev invites Deputy Gubarev to speak on the issue. He speaks about valuable natural resources going broad—oil, gas, and timber. He also criticizes the structure of imports—Japanese vacuum-cleaners and foreign medicines, for example. He says he will vote against Kamentsev's confirmation, because the policy of getting rid of our natural resources is a flawed one.

At 1518 GMT, Gorbachev invites Deputy Filshin to speak. He criticizes the leadership for not bringing about the radical changes that the crisis in our country demands. We have become debtors on the international scene and we don't have any strategy for putting this right. We have to have confidence that the people we confirm will be able to put things right. It's not enough to say that so and so is a good person. There has to be a program. I propose that we decide to give those being nominated today until the end of the year to produce some results. At the end of the year there should be a vote of confidence. Finally: 7 of the 13 deputies come from the military-industrial complex. Why? The issues we have to tackle now are in a completley different area.

Kamentsev Appointment Approved

LD3006164789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1527 GMT on 30 June continues its recorded relay of the 30 June proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

Gorbachev invites deputy Tsavro to take the floor. He speaks in support of Kamentsev.

At 1528 GMT, Gorbachev invites comrade Ogarok to take the floor. Ogarok begins to speak about the large proportion of natural resources in Soviet exports. It is very difficult, he says, to restructure this. We understand that there are many shortcomings in this regard; but in just over 2 years Kamentsev and his colleagues have managed to get a system going, albeit one that is not perfect. And frequently the fault is ours locally because we are unwilling to do the best we can to secure exports. Kamentsev has all the potential to complete what he has started

At 1533 GMT, Deputy Kasyan takes the floor and speaks about efforts made to export agricultural produce. He speaks about the difficulties that result from lack of available transport facilities and packing materials. He will support Kamentsev but intermediary firms are needed to help farms with their export business.

At 1536 GMT, an unidentified deputy takes the floor. He speaks of the advantages to be gained through the use of intermediaries in international trade and he raises the issue of closed zones, like Kamchatka. He asks whether it is right that such zones remain completely closed. And he says we should be attracting currency from abroad. He supports Kamentsev's candidature.

At 1541 GMT, Deputy Desyatov takes the floor and raises a number of ecological points with special reference to forestry. He recalls being told to increase timber production by 5 percent. What does this means? It means increased soil erosion. And take our water resources, the amur was taken first as a fish resource—then exploitation of sand was allowed. As a result fish production has fallen drastically from previous levels. He talks about the threat to salmon stocks in the Far East.

At 1546 GMT, Deputy Sukhov from Kharkov takes the floor. He recalls times past when the country used to export grain to many countries, and quite a lot of meat, too. We used to have more meat, now we have less: So I'd like to know how much we are exporting now. I'm a driver and I know how short of fuel we are. So I'd like to know how much oil we are exporting. We need discipline. We went without gasoline for 4 months; some people got used to working just 3 or 4 hours a day so that they continued doing so even when supplies were resumed.

At 1550 GMT, Gorbachev asks Ryzhkov to take the floor.

At 1559 GMT, Gorbachev says we've had a useful and important discussion: All the observations made, even the emotional ones, have been correct. On one point he disagrees: It is wrong to say that everything we have done has been a mistake. You have the information necessary to make up your minds now. So, we have the proposal that Kamentsev be appointed. All those in favor please vote. The votes are counted. Gorbachev announces: 246 in favor, out of 438 deputies present, 97 voted against. Three hundred ninety-nine took part in the voting, Gorbachev says. Then he corrects himself: 409 voted, 56 abstained. He announces a 20-minute break.

At 1608 GMT, a recording of the next session begins with Lukyanov chairing the session. He calls on Nikolay Laverov, who has been nominated to head the state committee on science and technology, to address the session.

In reply to a question, Laverov admits that insufficient use is being made of possibilities for generating power on small rivers. This is an important area for the restructuring of power generation he says. As for what can be done to alleviate the pollution of the Caspian Sea, Laverov says this is a very complicated problem. I welcome an all-around approach to it. A third question on how we can stop agriculture lagging so far behind scientific discovery—Laverov says we need steps taken by the whole state to correct this. Regarding correspondence courses, he says that it often happens that people who have studied by correspondence course are not as capable as others. Asked about policy not just to catch up the West but overtake it, he says the answer lies in the correct selection of priority areas. We mustn't repeat overseas technology, we must make our own breakthroughs. Laverov then discusses energy transmission losses, secondary education standards, the way in which engineers and workers are paid, his attitude toward a flexible organizational structure for science, the diverse forms linking science with production, computer equipment for the deaf and blind, how enterprises can be persuaded to take up inventions.

Laverov Confirmed

LD3006175189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1628 GMT on 30 June continues its recorded relay of the 30 June proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

Asked about his attitude toward nuclear power generation following Chernobyl and the rejection of this by the people, Laverov says that we have no alternative to nuclear power generation at the present time: The task is to make nuclear power safe.

Regarding the solution to social problems, he urges giving priority to solving food industry problems and to the fight against disease. Regarding the problem of the Aral Sea, we must have a coordinating center on the sea working on an international basis, he says. A program is now being worked on which will involve international organizations in the problem—UNESCO and others. Forecasts of an earthquake in the 1990's in Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy are a very serious matter. Buildings have to be strengthened, the population has to be prepared.

In answer to further questions, Laverov says he supports differentiating the status of academicians, corresponding members, and republican academicians; he says more should be done to exploit solar energy; more should be done to speed up the setting in motion of scientific and technical programs; ecological safety should be enhanced; more should be done to interest the younger generation in science and technology; and a more efficient patenting system should be introduced.

At 1647 GMT, Lukayanov invites Deputy Kisin from Moscow to take the floor. Kisin says that the programs of the science and technology committee are large and complicated but are alienated from what is being done at the academies of sciences. The potential inherent in the schools system is not being used to the full.

At 1651 GMT, Deputy Akayev takes the floor. He recommends Laverov warmly for the post of chairman of the state committee on science and technology.

At 1654 GMT, Deputy (Tsapin) takes the floor in support of Laverov but complains of the lack of the high-quality crop strains in agriculture that they have overseas. We are badly in need of scientists' help in this respect. And the USSR Government is not alone in carrying the blame; the governments of the republics are also responsible.

At 1659 GMT, Deputy (Shatanov) takes the floor and speaks of the shortage of water near Alma-Ata following the digging of a canal. Ecology is a frontline battle where we are suffering defeat after defeat.

At 1704 GMT, Lukyanov says the discussion is over and calls for a vote: Lukyanov asks those in favor to raise their cards, then those against. Seven vote against, and two abstain. Laverov is appointed deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology.

At 1706 GMT, Lukayanov reads out a written proposal that the standing orders be changed to require a quorum for votes. Lukyanov says it is a sensible proposal and suggests that a proper proposal to this effect be drawn up. This is decided without a vote.

At 1707 GMT, Lukyanov says the committees and commissions will work tonight—the committee on defense and state security; the committee on construction and architecture; the committee on glasnost, human rights, and appeals of citizens; the commission on labor, prices, and social policy; and the commission on national policy and ethnic relations.

Luykanov says that the joint session will resume at 1000 [0600 GMT] on 3 July.

At 1710 GMT, correspondent Zorin recapitulates on the main decisions of the day's session. The recorded relay ends.

Sizenko To Join RSFSR Council of Ministers

PM2206134789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree "On the Appointment of Comrade Ye.I. Sizenko as First Deputy Chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolves:

To appoint Comrade Yevgeniy Ivanovich Sizenko first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

[Signed] V. Vorotnikov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
S. Chistoplyasov, secretary of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
Moscow, 21 June 1989.

Ukraine Komsomol First Secretary Interviewed

18001228 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Valeriy Ivanovich Tsybukh, chairman of the committee of youth affairs of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by I. Korolkov; date, place not specicifed]

[Text] **The chairman of the committee for affairs of youth of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Valeriy Ivanovich Tsybukh is 38 years old. By education he is an engineer-builder. He has worked for the past 3 years as the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Young Communist League] of the Ukraine.**

[Korolkov] All of us who have been following the work of the congress have paid attention to how mistrustfully many deputies have received the proposals of the presidium to create one commission or another or to nominate one deputy or another. There are reasons for this mistrust. For many decades electoral organs have rubber-stamped decisions that were essentially adopted by the apparatus, merely giving them the appearance of being democratic. Tell us, please, about the mechanism for your nomination for such a high position.

[Tsybukh] When I was elected deputy I immediately wanted to work on the commission for youth affairs. (So, incidentally, did many other deputies.) On the eve of the congress with a deputy group from the Komsomol and young deputies elected from the okrugs we pondered over who could be in charge of the committee. I was named among several other people. Then, after the congress was already in session, at the next meeting of the group I was suggested to head the committee. A day before the joint meeting of the chambers I was invited to visit the chairman of the Soviet of the Union Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov and, referring to the opinion of the young deputies, he made the same suggestion. I agreed.

[Korolkov] I must admit that I was very surprised that you were not asked a single question during the time of the election. On the one hand you avoided a fairly unpleasant procedure. But on the other this could mean that there was not enough interest in you (and the committee). And here is the question—which is worse?

[Tsybukh] I should note that I was not the only one who was not asked any questions. Perhaps this is to the credit of the person who nominated the candidates: the deputies might have liked his description. But, of course, one cannot rule out the idea that the typical attitude toward youth had an effect. And yet youth in our country comprise 43 percent of the able-bodied population. And if today we say that social tension is increasing in the country, it is increasing mainly in this environment. Low wages, the impossibility of obtaining housing or placing children in day schools, and along with this the lack of confidence in youth and their lack of an opportunity to really influence their destiny—all these are facts of our life and not to notice them means to lead the country into the most critical social conflicts. At first our committee's task, in my opinion, will be to change public opinion regarding youth as a category which is supposed to have no problems or at any rate on which there is no need to focus attention.

[Korolkov] Valeriy Ivanovich, there was a commission for affairs of youth in the Supreme Soviet previously. But youth did not feel the effect of its activity. Will this committee not repeat the fate of its predecessor?

[Tsybukh] I think not. The political conditions in which it will be working have changed. While the commission merely heard about the state of affairs in one sphere or another and developed recommendations that were not binding and were frequently far from reality, the committee today must, as they say, keep its finger on the pulse of the society. It should have a clear picture of what is happening in the youth environment, enlisting sociologists, economists, philosophers, and legal experts for

analysis. And as a result it should develop laws which would regulate social relations. A law is not a recommendation. The more so under conditions where people's activity is awakening and the significance of legal knowledge is growing.

[Korolkov] It has already been a year since the phrase "strong youth policy" made its way into our political lexicon. How do you intend to implement this strong youth policy? What will be your first steps?

[Tsybukh] Life itself forced us to take the first step. We sent two of our young deputies to Fergana to discover the reasons for the conflict that was heating up there. We know that it was mainly youth 20-25 years of age who were participating in the disorders. Many of them were unemployed. Why? Who formed the region's production and social policy which apparently served as one of the causes of the tragic events, and how was it formed? On the basis of information received from our deputies, we intend to ask questions of people running for the posts of ministers and chairmen of state committees. We are interested in their positions regarding youth and the measures they intend to take to solve the problems that have accumulated in the Central Asian republics. The events in Fergana convince us once again that we need a legal mechanism for protecting the interests of workers, members of the intelligentsia, and the peasants. Without this discussions of social justice are a lot of noise. Therefore as soon as the formation of the committee is completed we shall immediately begin to prepare a draft law "On youth and the state youth policy in the USSR." As we know, it was developed by young jurists, discussed at the last plenum of the Komsomol Central Committee, and recommended for discussion in the Supreme Soviet.

[Korolkov] The plenum of the Komsomol Central Committee discussed the draft law.... Many deputies included on the committee were members of the Komsomol.... Will the committee not be something like a Komsomol lobby in the Supreme Soviet?

[Tsybukh] By no means. This was mentioned by Ye. Primakov when he introduced me at the joint meeting of the chambers. This will be a state committee which reflects the interests of youth as a whole and defends them. This is not an ideological but a legal committee which will engage in draft legislation.

[Korolkov] At the congress there was an extremely sober evaluation of the economic position into which the country has been led by the monopolism of the producers. Judging from everything, the Supreme Soviet will begin to develop an antimonopoly law. But monopolism has led such a powerful youth political organization as the Komsomol into a severe crisis as well. It has become obvious that the Komsomol cannot express the interests of all categories of youth. It is no accident that during the past 2-3 years a number of various kinds of associations and clubs have sprung up in the country. Do you not think that the committee should consider giving any youth formations whose regulations and programs do not contradict the constitution the right to exist?

[Tsybukh] Undoubtedly. Our committee will participate in the development of a draft law concerning independent social organizations and will work for its adoption. I would just like to explain that our committee is not an organization that united various youth formations. The committee's purpose is to know the situation in the youth environment and to use legal acts to create normal conditions for youth to realize its economic, social, and political rights. We must use legal acts to regulate interrelations between youth and the state in such a way that it can express its creative potential most fully.

[Korolkov] I think that you will encounter certain difficulties in implementing such a program, mainly from the Komsomol. After all, over many years it has gradually been transformed from a social organization into a state structure. And no department likes to share its rights, regardless of how much it may have declared its democratic nature. This can be expressed, it seems to me, in the fact that the Komsomol wants to preserve its leadership legislatively. And since some of the deputies on the committee have been elected from the Komsomol—you yourself are the secretary of a large Komsomol organization—departmental interests can be taken into account.

[Tsybukh] They no longer can be. Quite recently attempts at this were made in preparing the law on youth. Certain comrades wanted very much to place the Komsomol in advantageous conditions as compared to other youth associations that are appearing. It did not happen. I also spoke against legislative reinforcement of the leadership because I was convinced that authority must be won through works, in a competition of minds. I repeat: the political situation in our country has changed. One of the Western newspapers, when evaluating Gorbachev's activity, noted that he is becoming more of a president than a general secretary. This is very significant. This is the way it should be in a rule-of-law state. Changes take place in the social awareness and in the awareness of individual leaders. The responsibility placed on them by the voters, the congress, and the Supreme Soviet is a qualitatively different kind of responsibility from the kind that existed even a half year ago. And it requires that we proceed not from the preferences for the interests of one group of people or another but from an accounting for the interests of all groups and categories of the country's population. Our committee will serve as a legal guarantee of the accounting for these interests.

[Korolkov] I see that you are already preparing to carry out your new duties—you have acquired the book "Legislative Acts of the USSR. Questions of Deputy Activity."

[Tsybukh] I am constantly thinking about the many things I have to do. Which people still must be enlisted for work on the committee, what kind of program to

draw up, what research to order first from scholars, which sociological data about youth to request, what legal and economic literature to go through next month. I feel an immense weight on my shoulders.

[Korolkov] Apparently you will soon be moving to Moscow.

[Tsybukh] I do not know for sure yet. I am now putting my things in storage and I am going home for a week. And I do not know what will happen after that.

[Korolkov] Good luck.

[Tsybukh] Thank you.

State Regulation of Democratization Process Urged
18001253 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by V. Danilenko, doctor of historical sciences: "We Opt for Democracy"]

[Text]"Democracy"—this is a word that is on everyone's tongue; it dots the columns of newspapers and the pages of magazines... But in many cases what prevails here is a clearly simplistic view of democracy, a misunderstanding of its essence and the conditions for its possible existence and development. Democracy is regarded almost as a panacea for all problems, a universal pass key which in and of itself opens up the way to solving all problems, which always and in everything produces nothing but positive results.

Alas, this is far from true. When taking a step in the direction of democracy we frequently stumble right away and end up with something quite different from what we counted on. For example, we introduce a democratic policy for creating cooperatives in order to unleash the creative initiative and enterprisingness of the people—and immediately we come up against mass speculation, self-seeking, and, as a consequence, dissatisfaction with cooperatives on the part of the population. We change over to election of the directors and to our surprise we discover in that many cases the ones who are elected are not those who are most active and concerned about production, but those who are the easiest, who are the least demanding and fault-finding. We speak about freedom of literary creativity and we see what is almost a "war of magazines." We contribute to the all-around increase in the political activity of the masses, to the creation of new social organizations—and immediately the radicals from the Democratic Union impose their presence, or extremists from Pamyat work in their cliques....

In other words, in practice democracy turns out to be a much more complicated and internally contradictory phenomenon. In addition to the positive results it also produces negative ones as a side product. Naturally, the question arises: Is it possible to avoid or at least limit the costs? It is. But to do this it is necessary to have a clear idea of what democracy is.

First of all: democracy is not a variety of weak power. It is quite inadmissible to attempt to contrast democracy and the state, to link the process of democratization to the weakening or limiting of state regulation of sociopolitical life. This is the worst kind of confusion. For democracy is possible only within the framework of state organization of the society and is, essentially, one of the forms of the state.

Precisely here lies the objective dialectic of democracy, the internal mechanism for its preservation and development: while provided for control according to the will of the majority of the people, pluralism of opinions, freedom of the press and demonstrations, and the activity of social organizations, democracy—and this is precisely why it guarantees all this—must regulate in detail all aspects of sociopolitical life, it must be able to defend itself.

Lenin's approach to democracy, which reveals the dialectical interconnection of all of its aspects, makes it possible to delve more deeply and precisely into our political reform, into its difficulties and contradictions.

The most important direction of the reform is the elimination of the command-administrative method of management. But one can by no means equate the elimination of this system with a weakening of the role of the state. On the contrary, its role and significance should sharply increase under the conditions of the expansion of the process of democratization, for this process must not be random. Democracy cannot be simply permitted. It is a mistake to assume that it is sufficient to "loosen the reins," to remove restrictions, and democracy will emerge of its own accord during the course of free play of social and political forces. The only result in such a case would be anarchy and complete elimination of the conditions necessary for the development of democracy.

The peculiarity of the modern day is the clearly appreciable shortage of power of state leadership. To a certain degree this can be explained: taking into account the pathetic experience of pre-perestroyka times, public opinion cannot but be suspicious of a strong state, and this, in turn, cannot but be reflected in the actions of the current leadership. Yet the shortage of power and activity of state leadership inevitably impedes the processes of perestroyka. This is not a matter of rates or that these processes should be stepped up; it is that these processes must be more efficiently regulated and directed.

Again we have an externally paradoxical situation—we have long complained about excessive regulation of our life and today we are complaining about a shortage of

this. The essence of the problem is that there is regulation and then there is regulation. Previously, departmental regulation actually obstructed regulation of social life by means of the law and was a source of bureaucratization of state administration. Today we need a principally different kind of regulation—regulation of the process of democratization. And this regulation should be carried out legislatively, providing legal guarantees both of the irreversibility of the processes that have been noted and of their general sociopolitical direction. And the more detailed the legal regulation is, the more democracy and freedom there will be. The power of state leadership should be manifested here as well as, incidentally, the power of the state in the direct sense of the word, which is necessary in order to protect democracy from those who take advantage of democracy in trying essentially to undermine it.

The problems that have been noted, of course, can be resolved only radically by a transformed state. It itself should be deeply and consistently democratized—both on the plane of the formation of central organs of power and on the plane of their functioning. In all stages of the political process the decisive word should remain with the people actually and not just formally; the political and legal instruments of control by the people over the actions of all organs of power should always be highly effective. Only then will the power of the state not constitute a threat to the process of democratization. In this respect the strategy of the political reform precisely determined the basic unit—the change in the electoral system and the transformation of the USSR Supreme Soviet into the leading organ which has real authority of power. True, the question of parliamentary procedure remains open. For comparison I should like to note that the democratism of the parliamentary procedure in bourgeois countries is predetermined to a significant degree by the fact that, in the first place, the deputies are regarded as representatives of the nation as a whole, and not of individual regions of the country; and, in the second place, there is a strict voting discipline in party parliamentary groups. In other words, again the most important guarantee of democracy is efficient legal regulation of legislative procedure and the existence of discipline.

It is impossible to get away from the problem of the state apparatus. Whether we like it or not, state administration is impossible without a state apparatus. What should be criticized is not the apparatus itself but the principles of its present organization and work. A radical reform is truly needed here. Command-administrative methods of leadership should give way to an open, public democratic process of preparation and adoption of decisions at all levels and personal responsibility for decisions adopted by leaders of all ranks. It is necessary to put an end to the anonymity of the administrative process—and then the apparatus will work in a new way, in the interests of perestroyka and democratization.

A most important aspect of the democratization of the political process is the provision of socialist pluralism of opinions and the possibility of alternative variants of solutions to problems that arise. In the establishment of socialist pluralism, again an important role should be played by the state since pluralism is impossible without the corresponding institutional infrastructure, and only the state can provide it through legal regulation. This requires laws concerning social organizations, the press, the policy for conducting demonstrations, and so forth. And the law should not simply "allow," but regulate a specific issue in detail and predetermine the required direction of development, on the one hand, while actively contributing to the establishment of new sociopolitical relations, and, on the other, while introducing clearcut restrictions dictated by the social nature of power in our country.

For example, today there are a mass of informal social associations and organizations. It is a gratifying phenomenon which shows the sharp increase in the political activity of the population—a most important condition for the success of perestroyka. But does the activity of the informal associations always coincide with the course toward democratization of the society, and does it contribute to democratization? Very rarely do informal associations present their positions as one of the possible variants which, among others, could be discussed in search of an optimal solution. If they did this there would be no question about their positive role. But much more frequently they claim to hold the ultimate truth and what is worse, they are prepared to defend their views by any means and to impose their positions through force. And this in and of itself contradicts pluralism and undermines the foundations of the democratic process. And here we need direct intervention on the part of the state, we need a law which would guarantee the impossibility of encroachment on the principles of pluralism and democracy.

Nor can we fail to touch on the party system. Both before and during the congress much was said about having more than one party. Indeed, the multiparty system is one of the most widespread institutional forms of insuring pluralism of opinions and democracy. But who said that this is the only possible form? How does it follow that pluralism and democratism are impossible with only one party? Pluralism, of course, is incompatible with the single-party system of pre-perestroyka times. But today the situation is radically changing—there will inevitably be changes also in the party itself, the methods of its activity, and the nature of its interrelations with the state.

The law on the press should play an important role in the creation of a legal base for pluralism. In Vienna our country made some very serious commitments in this respect. It is now a matter of fulfilling them in the norms of intrastate legislation. The law should provide for freedom of speech as well as the right to complete, prompt, and precise information for all citizens. But at the same time the law should envision an effective

political and legal mechanism that precludes the possibility of the utilization of these freedoms for purposes that contradict the interests of socialist pluralism and democracy.

Finally, about the freedom of meetings and demonstrations. Without this freedom, of course, true democracy is impossible. Should just any demonstrations be permitted? It is my firm conviction that the answer should most likely be in the negative. Restrictions can and should exist for political reasons—demonstrations with nationalist, racist, chauvinist, militarist, neofascist, and other slogans are not allowed. By the same token, demonstrations during the course of which the demonstrators resort to force or create a threat to the health and lives of people are not permitted. The application of state power against "demonstrations" of this kind is inevitable. But it is power within the framework of the law. And for this the law should clearly and specifically establish the kinds of demonstrations, the concrete conditions, and the forms in which force may be applied, who may give the corresponding order, and what the specific responsibility is for unjustified use of force, abuse of it, and so forth. And the formulations of the law must be extremely precise and preclude the possibility of their arbitrary interpretation. Only then is it possible to avoid a repetition of events analogous to those that took place in Tbilisi, Minsk, Ryazan.... Only then will the power of the state serve the interests of democracy.

In other words, without all-around active participation of the state there can be no true democratization of the political process. A corroboration of this is provided by the difficulties we encountered in the initial stage of perestroyka, which were also encountered, incidentally, during the centuries of experience of bourgeois democracy. For democratization is to a society as spring is to nature: with the onset of the warm weather everything begins to blossom out and grow rapidly—both the beautiful flowers and the ugly weeds. And it is very important that the weeds not suffocate the good shoots. Here is where the power of authority, the power of law is needed.

Medvedev Addresses Academy Graduates 23 Jun

LD2406033389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 23 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The latest graduation of students and post-graduate students at the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee took place today.

[Correspondent L. Elin, identified by caption] [passage omitted] The participants were addressed by Vadim Andreyevich Mevedev. He said, in part:

[Begin Medvedev recording] We are going through a period which is difficult and complex, but which is very crucial and very important for the further development of the country and for its destiny. These complex processes were revealed in full measure in the work of the first Congress of People's Deputies, which in spite of the complexity and the multilayered and ambiguous nature of the processes revealed at it is nevertheless undoubtedly a very major landmark in the country's sociopolitical development, and is essentially opening up a sort of new phase in our development, and I think that each one of us feels this perfectly well. We felt it while observing the work of the congress and we feel it while following the subsequent events, including the work of the bodies of the newly created USSR Supreme Soviet, which is now engaged in forming the composition of our government. [Video shows Medvedev at rostrum.] [end recording]

[Elin] The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee went on to dwell on questions concerning political reform in society, stressing the complexity of the processes taking place here in solving certain problems.

[Begin Medvedev recording] And very many of them have gathered head. They include the questions of the ideological and theoretical interpretation of restructuring. The question of what we are moving toward, what we want to achieve, what kind of renewed society we are seeking. One thing is clear: That is that we should move along the road of renewing socialism, and I mean socialism, as a society which represents the highest stage of social progress, heir to all the best that has been accumulated by world civilization. And at the same time, a society at the center of which stands man, a society of the working man and for the working man. An enormous task faces our social science front here, but unfortunately social science thought has somehow become depressed and has somehow grown quiet. We must lift it up and invigorate it, conduct more discussions, comparisons of views and searches, and the main thing is we must take a more careful look at what is happening in life. I believe that the detachment of party workers who have attended a good theoretical school here and who have received their theoretical tempering can and must make their contribution to the working out of these problems. [applause] [end recording]

Speaks on Restructuring

LD2406181389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1555 GMT 24 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 24 June (TASS)—A festive meeting devoted to the latest graduation of students and post-graduates took place on 23 June in the party's leading teaching institution, the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee.

Vadim Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed those taking part in the meeting. He pointed out the significance of the first Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR which has taken place. The congress was a major landmark in the country's sociopolitical development.

Whereas earlier development of the prerequisites for reforming the political system of society was under way, now this has taken the form of a real process, which will receive further all-around development and be further deepened, the speaker said.

Going on to describe the course of restructuring in the economic sphere, he stressed that this has already started to yield certain results. However, the situation has become acutely more difficult due to a number of factors. In spite of all the difficulties, however, the speaker stressed, there is only one choice: to deepen economic reform.

Restructuring has produced the most tangible and practical results in the spiritual-ideological sphere, but complex, ambivalent processes have arisen here too, Vadim Medvedev noted. There has been an acute conflict of opinions on a number of fundamental issues of society's development. The CPSU Central Committee secretary noted that the aggravation of the discussion around the role of the CPSU is giving rise to the greatest concern. There were attacks against the party. "I am profoundly convinced;" he said, "that the main reason is that the need for deep changes in its activity has grown acute but these changes are taking place too slowly."

The concept of socioeconomic development needs constant attention. We should proceed here from the premise that the party should not direct economic processes as it did before. However, the development of economic strategy and political influence upon economic development remain one of the main spheres of CPSU activity, Vadim Medvedev stressed.

On the proposal put forward by certain organizations that an extraordinary congress of the CPSU should be convened, Vadim Medvedev said he did not believe this to be expedient in conditions of a great number of urgent problems. All the party's efforts should now be concentrated on the practical implementation of the most burning issues, he stressed.

Addressing the academy's graduates who are citizens of the socialist countries, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said that each socialist country has its own specific conditions, its own tasks, and its own way of formulating pressing problems. "We are not at all in favor of our country's experience being mechanically transferred to other socialist countries and we are not in favor of everything taking place in our country today being blindly supported," he stressed. "It is up to each ruling party to choose and substantiate effective ways and means for development. We are sure, however, that it is extremely useful and necessary to study each other's experience, to compare and discuss without prejudice the approaches of each party."

A search is under way in each socialist country, at times an agonizing search, for methods of solving problems. We must meet more often, discuss things with each other more and talk about our problems. This will help in the solution of internal issues upon which each party is working as well as in the solution of our common tasks, he said.

PRAVDA Reports Address

PM2706131989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Cadres Reinforcement for Restructuring"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting to mark the latest graduation of students and postgraduates was held 23 June in the party's leading educational institution—the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences.

The graduates were greeted by R.G. Yanovskiy, the academy's rector, and Professor A.G. Kulikov. A.Ya. Durnev, G.R. Raykova (Bulgaria), and F. Chernush [name as transliterated] (Hungary) spoke on behalf of the students and postgraduates.

V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed the meeting's participants. On behalf of the party Central Committee he cordially congratulated the graduates on completing their studies and receiving higher party-political education.

In these days, in these hours, V.A. Medvedev noted, each of you is in a mood of exhilaration based on a sense of satisfaction at what you have done during your years at the academy. And you are probably already returning mentally to the next period of your activity, full of expectations of forthcoming work in the party organizations. And nonetheless I should like to turn your attention from personal moments to the problems by which our society and our party are living at the present very crucial stage of restructuring, of drastic importance for the country's further development.

A feature of the stage we are living through was fully reflected in the work of the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Despite the complexity and diversity of the processes which appeared at it and which are entirely natural at the birth of a new democratic mechanism of power, the Congress was a major milestone in the country's sociopolitical development. Essentially it opened a new period in our development. Whereas before the prerequisites were being worked out for the reform of society's political system, now this has merged into a real process which will receive further all-around development and intensification.

We are living through the drastic breakdown of previous forms of our state and party life. The real transfer of all state power to the soviets puts them in new conditions and gives rise to the need for new methods of work for the party and public organizations. But that is ony the first step, which should be followed by a second step—

the assertion of real, full power for the soviets at republican and local level. A stage which is to some extent even more complex and crucial. Especially as it is accompanied by the need to resolve aggravated problems of interethnic relations.

Going on to describe the course of restructuring in the economic sphere, the speaker stressed that it has already begun to produce some results. But the economic reform is proceeding with great difficulties. The situation has been sharply complicated because of a number of factors of not only an objective but also a subjective order and because of the failure to consider the real conditions of our development. The consumer market has been disorganized, which has caused complexity in the social and psychological situation in the country and created an unfavorable background for the party's activity during the election campaign and the Congress of People's Deputies.

But despite all the difficulties we must not stop. To stop and, all the more so, to move back would mean irreparable damage to our socioeconomic and political development and the destiny of restructuring. There is only one path—deepening economic reform.

It is believed that it is in the spiritual and ideological sphere that restructuring has produced the most visible practical results. That is indeed so. But here too complex, diverse processes have emerged. There has been a keen clash of opinions on a number of fundamental questions of society's development. Extreme views both of a conservative, dogmatic nature and an adventurist nature going beyond socialist pluralism have been revealed here.

The greatest concern is caused by the aggravation of discussions around the role of the CPSU and the content, style, and methods of its work under present conditions. Problems connected with the state of the party's authority, the prestige of the party apparatus and the party worker, and the title of Communists are being raised and discussed with great alarm. Attacks on the party have arisen in direct or covert form. All this demands a very serious analysis and specific and vigorous practical political and ideological actions on the part of the party committees. I expressed myself on this subject at the recent Moscow City Party Committee plenum, V.A. Medvedev said, and I now stress just one thing: I am deeply convinced that the main reason is that there is an urgent and acute need for in-depth changes in its activity, yet these changes are proceeding only slowly.

For many years now we have been repeating that the party should switch from its previous functions, when it controlled everything and was directly built into the mechanism of social and state management, to the role of the party as the political vanguard. But unfortunately there have been no serious advances here on either the practical or the theoretical plane.

Some party committees and party workers have found themselves in a state of virtual psychological shock in the new political situation and are quite unable to lose the habit of the former methods of leadership of the yea or nay kind, of complete and utter control over all processes, and of the direct management of state and public organizations.

I am not going to claim that we already have full, detailed, and clear knowledge of how we must act in present-day conditions. Our common task is to seek the best possible approaches and means. I believe that the detachment of party workers who have gained sound theoretical knowledge here can and must make their contribution to the elaboration of pressing problems. There are very many of them today. They include the deepening of the ideological and theoretical concept of restructuring and full clarification of the question of where we are going and the sort of renewed socialist society we wish to attain. That is a most serious question. It acquires special urgency because advice of a highly dubious nature is being offered, right up to the idea of borrowing forms of social life which are alien to socialism. Naturally, we cannot take such a path.

At the same time—and this is perhaps the main point that we come up against—we have unwillingness to critically reinterpret obsolete ideas which are clearly compromised, to take contemporary experience into account, and to respond to pressing needs. We must follow the path of radically renewing our society as an actual socialist society which represents a further stage of social progress inheriting all the best born of world civilization. And at the same time a society which focuses on the man of labor with his broad range of needs and interests.

In this context, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee dwelled on the role of our social science, emphasizing the need to significantly step up debates, compare views, and seek the best possible theoretical solutions to pressing problems. The main thing is to look more attentively at what is happening in life itself, to study the incipient progressive trends and phenomena in life, and to promptly notice any contradictions in the new restructuring processes.

We must thoroughly examine the concept of socioeconomic development, especially that part of it which has broad political and ideological application. We must proceed in this work from the premise that the party should not manage economic processes in the way it used to do before, essentially elevating itself above state and economic organs.

But the rejection of the party's direct intervention in the economy's leadership does not at all mean that it must leave the economic sphere outside the scope of its influence. Elaboration of economic strategy and political influence on economic development remain one of the main spheres of the CPSU's activity.

This applies to all levels and links of society, beginning with the primary production cell. The party organization, being the labor collective's nucleus, must of course exert its influence on economic activity—not by means of direct party committee instructions but by political methods through work in the labor collectives which must effectively exercise the right to monitor the administration's activity.

Cadre questions are being formulated in a new fashion. The promotion of the leaders of the restructuring formation and the backup for their theoretical and political training—all this demands new approaches. What picture emerged at the Congress of People's Deputies? We saw young and energetic speakers raising key questions of party and state life. And yet many of them ended up as people's deputies not through nomination by party organizations, not thanks to the support of rayon and city committees, but often enough despite them. This simply forces us to ponder: Are we all doing everything to ensure that the best, creatively minded young workers, collective farm members, and members of the intelligentsia are recruited to the party aktiv, that they are given an opportunity to fully deploy their potential in the sphere of restructuring?

I think that we must not, in any circumstances, allow any self-isolation of party cadres. We need constant movement and mutual enrichment between the party apparatus and the different spheres of our activity. The party organizations must recruit and absorb the best forces, primarily among young people who always enjoy an advantage over their elders as regards education, energy, and freshness of ideas.

All this indicates that there are many pressing questions demanding broad party-wide discussion. It is necessary to seriously prepare for a thorough conversation on the entire package of problems of the party's ideology, policy, and organizational work in the present conditions.

Some organizations put forward the proposal to convene an extraordinary CPSU congress. I personally believe that this is inexpedient, bearing in mind the large quantity of immediate problems. All the party's efforts now must be concentrated on the practical implementation of the most burning questions. We have ahead of us the second Congress of People's Deputies and the elections to republic and local soviets. At the same time, we ought not to rule out the possibility of the next, 28th, CPSU Congress being brought forward. So you will be joining the party committees at exactly the right time. From the very first day, you must get most actively involved in political and ideological work aimed at resolutely overcoming everything that is still applying the brakes on restructuring at local level.

I wish to say a few words to our friends from socialist countries who have graduated from the academy. You were given an opportunity to supplement your education, to extend your theoretical ideas in various spheres of social science, and to get, to a greater or lesser extent, a taste of our tumultuous practice of restructuring. I think that each one of you has developed a certain opinion on this account, and we hope that this opinion is in favor of restructuring, in support of the work being done by our party and our entire people.

I would also like to add that every socialist country has its own specific conditions, its own tasks, its own formulation of pressing problems. We do not in any way advocate that our country's experience be automatically applied in other socialist countries, we do not advocate indiscriminate backing for everything that is happening in our country today. The choice and substantiation of effective paths and means of development are up to each ruling party. But we are confident that the study of each other's experience and the comparison and unbiased discussion of each party's approaches are exceptionally useful and necessary.

We believe that socialism is living through a really complex and genuinely historical moment. Every socialist country is seeking—at times painfully—methods to solve problems. We need to meet more often, to debate more with each other, to discuss our problems. This will help us to solve the domestic questions on which each party is working and to solve our common tasks. I would like to wish each one of our friends tremendous success at work, personal happiness, and good health.

In conclusion, V.A. Medvedev once more ardently congratulated all graduates on completing their academy course, noting that the party is augmenting its ranks with a fresh detachment of trained cadres at a crucial stage of restructuring.

Regulations for Entry, Exit Eased

LD0507123989 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] A new bill has been prepared in the Soviet Union on entry and exit from the country. Spokesmen for the Soviet Justice and Interior Ministries point out the act should bring Soviet law in line with the Vienna agreements.

The bill drops the previous requirement that a Soviet citizen had to have for exit an invitation from private persons or an organization. Passports are being introduced for repeated trips on private business.

1988 Figures on Soviet Foreign Travel Published

18070269 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 19, 13-19 May 89 p 3

[USSR State Committee for Statistics table: "USSR Goskomstat Reports"]

[Text]

Number of USSR Citizens Traveling Abroad in 1988 (thousand people)

	Total	Breakdown by purpose of trip			
		Tourism	Business	Personal	To service means of transport
Total	4243	1041	834	809	1559
To socialist countries	2735	915	533	639	648
To CEMA states	2431	844	505	621	561
Bulgaria	436	248	56	51	81
Hungary	266	112	39	58	57
Vietnam	43	6	15	0	22
GDR	415	151	77	58	129
Cuba	50	7	15	2	26
MPR	171	4	119	4	44
Poland	613	113	119	298	83
Romania	141	51	11	30	49
Czechoslovakia	396	152	54	120	70
China	50	0.4	5	7	37
North Korea	17	2.5	3.4	0.1	11
Yugoslavia	135	68	18	11	38
To the developed capitalist countries	885	94	141	155	495
To the EEC countries	443	23	83	90	247
Great Britain	43	1	7	2	33
France	46	3	12	6	25
FRG	142	4	27	67	44
Italy	45	3	7	3	32
Belgium	18	0.5	4	1	12
Netherlands	26	0	3	1	22
United States	58	1	12	33	12
Japan	73	4	5	0	64
Austria	16	2	4	2	8
Norway	16	0	5	0	11
Finland	161	59	13	9	80
Sweden	48	0.8	4	3	40
To the developing countries	416	32	160	15	209

Gagauz Autonomy Activists Lobby Deputies

PM2206130589 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 7 Jun 89 pp 1, 3

[Report by own special correspondent Ye. Podgornov: "Responsibility for Restructuring"]

[Excerpt] Moscow—[passage omitted] As we have seen, deputies are concerned with finding specific ways of carrying out their voters' instructions. The latter, for their part, are reminding their elected representatives of them. A group of representatives of the Gagauz people and members of the "Gagauz Khalki" movement executive committee is here in Moscow.

"We have come here during the congress to meet with deputies from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], the Baltic, and Turkic-speaking republics and explain our objective to them," S. Bulgar said. "The decisions being made in Moldavia regarding the Gagauz do not live up to our hopes. We think that the republic leadership's position on creating Gagauz autonomy is very vague. We have, however, met with many deputies and acquainted them with our demands, namely the setting up of an autonomous republic as part of the Moldavian SSR.

"We want there to be no state languages on the future autonomous republic's territory but want the language of interethnic communication in all spheres to be Russian. There will then be no infringement on the rights of any nation or people. We should have a guarantee of the development of our national culture."

"Our demands," G. Arabadzhi added, "have been supported by some deputies."

In addition to envoys of the Gagauz people, many representatives of the Russian-speaking population have

come to see deputies in Moscow. People who are disturbed over the state of interethnic relations are taking time off work or coming here on vacation. When meeting with deputies they express their attitude toward the processes taking place in Moldavia and other regions of the country. This is only natural, as everyone wants to be sure of the future and of being able to live in peace and work for the good of their republics and the country as a whole. We hope that the congress will be able to draw up appropriate decisions. We also regard this as its responsibility for restructuring.

Pro-Armenia Congress Remarks on NKAO Assailed

PM2206131389 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 3 Jun 89 p 3

[Article by B. Guliyeva, leader of a problem-solving group of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Academy of Sciences Palace of the Friendship of the Peoples of the USSR, under the rubric "Listening to the Congress": "Forum of Restructuring"]

[Excerpts] The Congress in Moscow—the first nationwide forum of restructuring—was not a solemn review of democracy but a test of its durability and of opposition to the ossified principle of state power based on the apparatus and functionaries. Every stage in the ascent and triumph of democracy at the Congress, like the crisis points occurring during the discussions, are felt in our hearts, with the result that we are all agitated in both our spirit and our civic conscience. [passage omitted]

I am confident that none of us who followed the Congress' work on television was left unmoved by any of its sittings. But what worries me most is the unobjective attitude—and, therefore, one which is incompetent and imposed from outside—by a section of delegates toward the position of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] on the protracted conflict concerning Nagorno-Karabakh, a conflict of which the entire country is pretty well sick and tired.

It must be brought to the attention of all delegates that the multinational population of Azerbaijan, which is wholeheartedly in favor of a reasonable and peaceful settlement of the conflict, issues a unanimous call therefore not to yield to the slanderous and hysterical agitation which surfaced at the Congress.

Nagorno-Karabakh is an autonomous administrative subdivision of the sovereign Azerbaijan republic with its own Constitution, anthem, and coat of arms. The predominance of the Armenian population, historically formed and thus taken into account in the republic's administrative and political structure, obliges the government and the people of Azerbaijan to ensure the equal and free development of the Armenian section of the oblast's population. The same principles of equality and respect toward its Azerbaijani population must be observed in equal measure.

Neither the country nor the Congress has yet considered from the viewpoint of all the people that the Azerbaijani population of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] in Stepanakert has been deprived of the constitutional right to work. Children there, too, have been deprived of a constitutional right. Here is a disgraceful example: The Stepanakert secondary school, where around 700 Azerbaijani children used to study, has been prevented from working for over a year now! These realities are being obscured and overwhelmed at the Congress by the unscrupulously exaggerated aura of the "long suffering" Armenian population of the NKAO.

I do not believe that either the political wheeler-dealers or the instant "specialists on interethnic relations" in the spirit of Starovoytova can find the path of reconciliation. That will be found by the goodwill and wisdom of the working people themselves—Armenians and Azerbaijanis. They are linked by a single historical destiny and a community of songs, families, and traditions. They were and will continue to be brothers.

One more point: The truth must be the whole truth. I am resolutely opposed to the reduction of the assessment of the Nagorno-Karabakh events to the level of a local, regional conflict. From the very beginning the solution of the problem should have been approached from positions of general state interests.

Neither considerations of the preservation of democracy and the rule of law in our society nor the entirely understandable and noble desire of the party leadership and the supreme organs of state power for objectivity and justice in the settlement of the interethnic conflict can justify disputes which stir up the two peoples even further and threaten to aggravate the conflict, perpetuate interethnic strife in the region, and undermine the working people's faith in the legal guarantee of government decisions.

The implementation of the specific demand for the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh to the Armenian SSR is totally unacceptable, but not because of opposition on the Azerbaijani side. The satisfaction of territorial claims will inevitably cause a chain reaction destroying not only the administrative and territorial system but, most important, the ideological unity of our state.

I have been watching the Congress broadcasts with hope and faith that the voice of reason and the sense of a united family will triumph because if we are not true supporters of internationalism we—each one of us at our place of work—cannot be participants in restructuring.

Baku Paper Hits NKAO Delegate Speech

PM2306143189 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 7 Jun 89 p 3

[AZERINFORM special correspondent V. Rustamov dispatch: "We Have To Live Together"]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Jun—...On Tuesday morning USSR people's deputies were gathering in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses for their forum without the by now traditional heated and lively arguments and banter. Despite the 3-day recess they did not look rested and full of vigor.

The sad news of the catastrophe on the stretch of railroad between Chelyabinsk and Ufa which stunned all Soviet people had hit the people's deputies hard. A heavy burden was placed on their shoulders. The people's representatives were probably the first in the country to responded unanimously to this catastrophe by deciding to pay a day's wages into the charity fund for assistance to the victims of the catastrophe and their families. The country is doing what it can to ease the lot of the people who were hit by the terrible disaster and to help eliminate the consequences of the accident on the liquefied gas pipeline.

"Probably no one who was following the morning sitting of the congress on television could fail to notice the vexation reflected, in addition to the sadness, on the faces of the deputies after the address of Deputy B. Dadamyan, who was the first to speak," A. Namazova says. "During this hour of sadness for absolutely all Soviet people (incidentally, the same thing occurred during the earthquake in Armenia), the deputy from the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], and before him deputies from Armenia, tried by their discourteous and sometimes demagogical statements from the congress rostrum to gain cheap prestige among extremist-minded elements. Like me, most people probably perceived the hollow and unsubstantiated criticism leveled against the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, the NKAO Special Administration Committee, and Azerbaijan ministries and departments as yet another attempt to put pressure on USSR people's deputies and to sow discord and mutual mistrust between the Armenian and the Azerbaijani peoples. This address again contained the full range of hollow, unsubstantiated remarks which we have been constantly hearing since February of last year. In order to make it clear to oneself whose interests statements of this kind serve, it is enough to say that only Academician Sakharov applauded Dadamyan longer than anyone else, even getting to his feet."

"A letter signed by a large group of deputies from Leningrad, Moscow, and the Baltic republics expresses their attitude about the situation which has taken shape in interethnic relations, a letter which was used as the basis of an appeal to the population of Fergana Oblast and the NKAO," deputy T. Bagirov says. "Following this appeal to resolve by peaceful means on a legal basis the problems that have arisen, the address of the deputy from the NKAO was not very ethical—to put it mildly—with regard to the congress. After all, it does not become a people's representative to turn the school of democracy through which we are all passing at the congress into a school of malice and lies. The latter begin, as is well known, where reasoning and proof end. After all, it is no secret that in the complex economic conditions which prevail in the country the NKAO has been allocated substantial resources which immediately began to be assimilated at local the level.

However, the positive trends in the oblast's social and economic life have evoked an adverse reaction from extremist-minded groups. The organizers of strikes have chosen confrontation with the authorities and the NKAO Special Administration Committee. The deputy who as recently as early this year backed the committee and advocated the dissolution of the oblast party committee and the oblast soviet executive committee, gave vent to his unfounded dissatisfaction with the work of the committtee."

"In my opinion, the initiative to hold a referendum in the NKAO also lacks a legal basis," F. Rzayev says. "Because the NKAO issue is the prerogative of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] rather than that of the autonomous oblast, and, moreover, there is no law on referendums in the USSR Constitution. And even if it were to be held, it would have to be held on the territory of Azerbaijan as a whole with the participation of all the inhabitants of our republic. It is beyond doubt that a worthy rebuff will be delivered from the congress rostrum to the latest irresponsible attack on our republic."

"There is no excuse for foisting our viewpoint on the congress so unceremoniously, thus dragging it out and diverting it from the discussion of key questions which are of vital importance for our society as a whole," Z. Kyazimova says with unconcealed emotion, joining in the conversation. "Please understand me correctly, the deputies must not forget that the whole country is watching us, or rather the whole world. Therefore we must not follow the example of those who by their speeches incite confrontation and introduce nervousness at the local level without accepting responsibility for their words. Some of them have even agreed—the very thought is ridiculous—to express what are essentially politically illiterate territorial claims on Azerbaijan's Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. The Congress of People's Deputies has no authority either to annul the resolution of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee Caucasian Bureau on the inclusion of the NKAO in the Azerbaijan SSR. Appeals to deputies to show mutual respect and tolerance, to heed the voice of reason, and not to succumb to emotions have rung out from the congress rostrum more than once. Turning to my voters, I would like to say that interethnic problems can only be resolved by consolidating the healthy forces which account for the greater part of all peoples and ethnic groups rather than by putting forward claims and counterclaims."

...Every evening voters gather in front of the "Rossiya" and "Moskva" hotels where the congress participants are staying and engage the USSR people's deputies in frank and thorough discussions, exchange opinions and views, introduce proposals, and issue instructions. They include Azerbaijanis who have fled from Armenia. Their common opinion was expressed by M. Allakhberdiyev from the Noyemberyanskiy Rayon, Armenian SSR.

"From time immemorial Azerbaijanis and Armenians have lived and worked together, sharing their joys and sorrows. But now, for the second year in succession, a

handful of extremists have been inciting people and provoking clashes on interethnic issues as a result of which tens of thousands of Azerbaijanis have left their homes. In conversations with my compatriots I have gained the conviction that our sole desire is to return to our native hearths without delay, get down to work and study, and make our contribution to restructuring. This, in our view, is the only solution to the interethnic conflict, which no one wants. This is why we have come to Moscow to enlist the help of the country's supreme organs to enable us to return to our permanent places of residence."

Editorial note: In connection with the address of Deputy Dadamyan, the Azerbaijan deputies' group has submitted a petition to the USSR Prosecutor General, a report to the congress presidium is in preparation, and speeches by deputies representing our republic at the congress and in the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities are planned.

Peace March Begins in Estonia 24 Jun

LD2406204389 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 24 Jun 89

[Text] Tallinn June 24 TASS—Peace campaigners from Estonia and guests from other republics of the Soviet Union, as well as Finland, Sweden, Britain, Australia, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, and Bulgaria have set out on a peace march on the roads of Estonia on Saturday [24 June].

The March is being held on the initiative of public organisations and movements of the republic, the Soviet peace fund and the evangelical Lutheran Church of Estonia.

On their way the peace marchers will stop in towns and settlements for meetings and amateur art concerts.

On the final day of the March, August 6, they will reach Tallinn where a meeting is to be held in the townhall square of the old town.

Interethnic Tension in Estonia Noted

LD2406232189 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 24 Jun 89

[Text] Foreign residents in Estonia, alarmed by interethnic tension, have launched a campaign against this social ill. The internationalist action they've launched is called: There are no strangers in our home. A number of Estonian and Russian families have decided to exchange children for some time. After the announcement was published in the newspapers, many families from other republics have said they are willing to accept Estonian children for the time of the summer holidays.

'Top Priority' Program Views Nationalities Issue

LD2606113389 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 23 Jun 89

["Top Priority" program]

[Excerpts] [Kuznetsov] How do you do ladies and gentlemen, welcome to "Top Priority". I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host, and together with me in the studio are doctors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov. [passage omitted]

Gentlemen, I think the topic for today's discussion should be the problem of nationalities. We kept rescheduling this topic, at least two times, and now we've got another problem, this time not in Uzbekistan but in Kazakhstan, near the Caspian Sea, in the town of Novyy Uzen, with a population of 55,000, and I understand that during recent rioting 3 people were left—they were killed—and dozens wounded, and let's look at this problem more closely. There's, I think there is more to it than just brawls and riots: The pattern in Uzbekistan and in Kazakhstan was similar in the sense that the riots in Uzbekistan began allegedly after a brawl over, a quarrel over the price of strawberries, and the violence in Novvy Uzen was touched off by a quarrel in a disco, but then they evolved into very serious interethnic problems and...what's happening?

[Plekhanov] Well, I think those individual episodes, things that touch off these disturbances, are just sparks in powder kegs, and powder kegs have to do with unsatisfactory social conditions in those places. A lot of young people are disappointed, dissatisfied, with the way their life goes on, with the jobs that they have, with the kind of wages that they...

[Kuznetsov] Many don't have any jobs.

[Plekhanov] Many don't have any jobs at all. And when such a thing happens in a multiethnic environment that's a classic case. I mean, it has happened in other parts of the world so many times—that's a classic case for the appearance of ethnic clashes when one ethnic groups, group, starts to envy another one and there begins a conflict between people of different religions, different ethnic origins, different languages, and so on. I think it's, it's a classic pattern of social unrest acquiring ethnic and religious overtones. On the other hand there is of course such an important factor as the activities of various forces which are unhappy with perestroyka, which are afraid of perestroyka which are afraid of democratization and glasnost, and those people, for instance some organized crime groups which thrive in such situations, and which use the social unrest to direct attention away from their own machinations and wrong-doings to create destabilized, destabilization, political stabilization to distract the attention of the law enforcement authorities from the real problems of organized crime, and so on and so forth. There is that factor as well, which should not be minimized. [passage omitted]

[Kuznetsov] Despite all this there are people who blame perestroyka on the scope of economic mismanagement, on the scope of problems that we have, and even on the scope of interethnic strife. What do you think about it?

[Bogdanov] I think this is very wrong, and this is very understandable, why they are blaming perestroyka. First of all from (?which) quarters do you hear this, this accusation?

[Kuznetsov] Many people in the streets say that.

[Bogdanov] Many people? Well, we, let's talk about the informed public opinion and uniformed public opinion. I believe that in our society now we have the same division as in any other society. So, as to the informed public opinion, of course bureaucrats, they know, I mean bureaucrats sitting in all offices, party offices, government offices, public offices, whatever it is, they know quite well what it's all about, what it's all about, and my suspicion is that they are contributing by their own means into that unrest.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, Sergey, barely, briefly mentioned...

[Bogdanov] And at the same time they are spreading this rumor. By the way, now our society is a very peculiar society; this is a society of rumors. You have plenty of rumors circulating in Moscow, absolutely unbelievable rumors, spread by some, deliberately, by some mischievous people. So perestroyka, of course they blame perestroyka because perestroyka, this is something which is hurting them, first of all, hurting them. This is what [words indistinct] informed public opinion. As to the uninformed public opinion, of course this is our fault, and when I say our fault I mean people like we, like some other people, we have to explain to them, we have to go to them, we have to meet them and to explain to them what are the real reasons of all that. And you know, when you have somebody, a layman on the street, hurt by some ethnic unrest, of course he is not very busy in his mind explaining big, you know, reasons why. He is trying to find out the simplest reason, you know, very, very, understandable reason. Of course what, what is the reason—perestroyka; perestroyka. By the way, this is very dangerous, very dangerous development, and we have to deal, we have to deal with that. But whatever it is, of course you have basics of the problems and basics are social unresolved problems, first of all, social unresolved problems, and perestroyka to my mind contributed in a very positive way to enhance and to clarify all these problems which were boiling underneath for so many years, and my belief is, very strong belief, that one day (?or this), suppose we have no perestroyka, but one day or the other we would have not only unrest but kind of a, kind of an explosion that we could not be able to deal with in any reasonable way. So, in that way, perestroyka is a very positive, you know, contributor to that problem, that now we can deal with that.

[Kuznetsov] Gentlemen, there have been indications that Islamic fundamentalism has played a role in the Uzbek violence. I'll give you some facts: For example, while in West Germany, our President, Mikhail Gorbachev, was quoted as saying that it was not the case of interethnic strife so much as crude fundamentalism which has bared its teeth. Another indication that this fundamentalism has played a role in the Uzbek riots is a recent article in the leading Soviet army newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA or RED STAR, and the paper quoted the deputy interior minister of Uzbekistan as saying that as of last fall there were signs that certain forces, religious forces, or whoever, were organizing a pan-Islamic front with the aim of driving out the non-Muslim population from the Repblican. How serious is this problem? I don't think we raised it before. How serious is the problem?

[Bogdanov] Well...

[Kuznetsov] I understand you're not experts on Islam, but...

[Bogdanov] I'm not, I'm not an expert on Islam. Sergey, rather is more knowledgeable because, I just would like to remind our listeners that he spent quite some time in Afghanistan, and he...

[Plekhanov] Yeah, (?that's right).

[Bogdanov] Talks, talk Afghani—Pashto...

[Plekhanov] Yeah, and Farsi.

[Bogdanov] Farsi, and he might be more, more...

[Kuznetsov] OK. It's very good...

[Bogdanov] But, but I believe, I believe that still in my country—he may not agree or you may not agree with me—but this is not a real danger, this is rather a pretext, pretext for disturbances, pretext used by some mischievous, you know, elements trying to build up some antiperestroyka movement. And they're trying to use any, any, any slogans and pan-Islamic slogans to my mind are very appealing to lay people, to uninformed people, uneducated people. And they feel proud, they feel proud that with that slogan they're prevailing over other people. I understand it psychologically, I understand that.

[Kuznetsov] So you don't see any religion as a threat, Islam including?

[Bogdanov] (?Not yet) I don't.

[Kuznetsov] A question to you—you don't—a question to you: Is there any connection between the resurgence of Islam in this country and our involvement in the war in Afghanistan?

[Plekhanov] Well, I think there is a connection. In the first place, I don't consider myself an expert on Islam—20 years ago I did some studies of Iran and Afghanistan, but since then I've been thoroughly immersed in American affairs, where Islam is a minor factor. But, besides, there is not enough information about that. But I tend to share Dr Bogdanov's assessment that Islam as such is not a destabilizing factor, a threat to the existence of the Soviet state. One has to understand that the Muslim clergy, which is very strong both in central Asia and Azerbaijan, is thoroughly supportive of the Soviet government, and there are now better conditions for its activities, for the worshippers of Islam, and Islam is one of the many religions existing in the Soviet Union. In fact, I think after the Russian Orthodox Church that's the biggest religious denomination in the Soviet Union, and of course I think perestroyka is good for Islam, and the freer the Muslim worshippers are I think the more stable the situation is in those parts of the Soviet Union.

However, there are militant sects which always thrive on the fringes of Islam when the social conditions are bad. And those unhappy, frustrated, alienated young people are very good material for those sectarian leaders, fundamentalist leaders who could really incite them to rioting and other bad things.

[Kuznetsov] We've been looking south; now let's look in the direction of the West, and I mean the Baltic republics, and I understand there is a good deal of dissatisfaction with the current situation, and this dissatisfaction is far more politicized, I think and they are basically in favor of a greater economic independence, autonomy, and I understand that as of 1 January 1990 Estonia and Lithuania will begin their project which is, we refer to it as republican self-financing. Now...

[Plekhanov] Regional self...

[Kuznetsov] Regional, or republican self-financing. And we also know that in July, according to Vadim Medvedev, who is a Politburo member in charge of ideology, there will be a plenary, a full-scale meeting of the Communist Party Central Committee, and these people will discuss the problem of nationalities. I think that the situation is pretty bad, its critical, and I think that there will be a major overhaul of our policy in this area. In this very sensitive area. And perhaps we'll return to the idea, to the concept of federalism as was proclaimed...

[Plekanov] Real federalism.

[Kuznetsov] Real federalism as was proclaimed by Vladimir Lenin. What kind of expectations do you attach to this coming meeting of the Central Committee? Do you really (?expect) that it will come up with solutions or remedies or..?

[Bogdanov] No, solutions, remedies it sounds great, but I don't believe in quick solutions and remedies. And what I believe, that we should lay down solid, theoretical, if you like, grounds of the new vision of the national policy and national situation in this country. What you call, just now, coming from old Stalinist idea of federalism, to Leninist idea of federalism. And, after all, we should not be scared by real federalism. We should be, if you like, used mentally and psychologically to the new situation. More power to republics. This is very simple. So what's wrong with that?

[Kuznetsov] And a follow-up on this one because we're running out of time: Sergey, do you really believe that problems, whatever problems, be they nationalities, ethnic culture, whatever, can be solved without saving this, the country from its nose-dive economic crisis which we, basically we agree, we are in a very, very bad economic situation. I don't believe that any problem, including this one, can be solved without a rapid improvement in our economic performance.

[Plekhanov] I agree, I agree. The economic factor is crucial. It's like an irritant. The existing economic problems are like irritants to all other problems. Like pouring salt over the wounds. To heal the wounds you have to wash them of the salt.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you gentlemen, our time is up. We invite our listeners to join us again a week from now at the same time and on the same wavelength. I'm Pavel Kuznetsov, your host on "Top Priority" signing off. Goodbye.

Nationality Issue in Lithuania Discussed

LD2706195689 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 23 Jun 89

[From "The Way We Live" program]

[Text] During the past several weeks rumors about Lithuanians getting ready to take action against the non-Lithuanian population, first and foremost the Russian community, have been circulating throughout Lithuania. The Lithuanian mass media made a strong attempt to dispel these groundless rumors, nevertheless it cannot be denied that the nationality question is one of the most painful issues in present day Lithuania. Not only painful but very complicated, too, (?thus) those who keep on threatening us with possible interethnic clashes do not at all feel like playing down things. The world (?that) has already witnessed interethnic tensions in Azerbaijan, Khazakstan, Uzbekistan and other places in the USSR, would probably not be greatly surprised if something similar took place in Lithuania, the more so that in the USSR itself and especially in the so-called strong center, as Moscow is now often referred to, the rebirth of the Baltic republics is frequently identified with either the hooligan inspired unrest in Central Asian republics or the very specific problems of the Trans-Caucasian republics.

Before you get the wrong impression, I must point out to you one very important thing: The relations between the Lithuanian, Polish, Jewish and Russian communities cannot be described as being on the verge of an explosion.

But, as the saying goes, there is no smoke without fire. In the past, the problems of interethnic relations were discussed without using any smokescreens, only in close circles of friends or relatives, while the official press was very bombastic in describing the harmonious life of various nationalities. At the same time you could hear various squabbles and quarrels on the streets between a Lithuanian and a Russian or a Lithuanian and a Pole. The inherent Lithuanian submissiveness was first taken advantage of and then abused by quite a few newcomers to this country, who later decided to settle here for good. That Lithuania and its people have woken up to a new life doesn't seem to be to the liking of some who at first only grumbled, expecting that the changes would soon be brought to a stop. Yet recent developments indicate that Lithuania is ready to take a decisive historical step. Thus, seeing that verbal attacks can bring no results, certain circles resorted to other (?bolder) means, such as disseminating various leaflets carrying threats and allegations that Lithuanians were getting armed, setting up shock groups and so on. Good honest citizens realize that this is nothing else but a provocation aiming to incite unrest. And going along this line if the provocations did in fact materialize and there would be any victims this would undoubtedly give grounds to impose a curfew and a totalitarian peace would once again reign in Lithuania.

Under these circumstances we can say that Lithuania is taking a serious examination; and the subject—the reestablishment of the Lithuanian state under the conditions of a (?stable) political and social situation.

In Snieckus, a town in eastern Lithuania with a population of over 30,000, leaflets of this provocative nature have not been noticed to circulate. The foundations of Snieckus were laid down in the mid-seventies when the construciton of the Ignalina nuclear power station, the largest Chernobyl-type power station in the world, (?began). Since power engineering is not taught at Lithuanian universities and institutes, specialists in this area were brought in from all over the USSR—at present 97 percent of its population is made up of Russian-speaking people. Hence the reason why there are no leaflets directed against the non-Lithuanian population circulating here. But does that mean that all is well in Snieckus? No, life here is getting insufferable each day. I was told by everyone I spoke to, without a single exception, few if any seems [as heard] to be concerned about the termination of the construction of the third power block, or even the shortage of workforce. And people in Snieckus do not seem to be too consoled by the fact that their living conditions are much higher than anywhere else.

Why so, you might wonder. Well, the town and the nuclear power plant are both under the direct subordination of the Ministry of Atomic Energy of the USSR, which is more than lavish in its subsidies in the attempt to regain its tarnished prestige in the aftermath of the Chernobyl disaster.

But the main reason for anxiety among people in Snieckus is the nationality question, as well as the general political situation in Lithuania. We were very happy when Sajudis [Lithuanian Movement for Restructuring] as a movement emerged, I was told by several people I spoke to at the power station. Most likely, Sajudis did not have such a large group of non-Lithuanian followers anywhere else. But what happened later was the least we expected, they continued. Sajudis made an unexpected turn and began to propagate nationalism. People in Snieckus cannot understand the Lithuanians' desire to see their language the official state language, nor can they comprehend why Lithuanians insist on passing a law on Lithuanian citizenship and why they wanted the party to acquire a totally independent status. Ever since these demands were put forth people in Snieckus began to feel that tensions were mounting. They began to see themselves as secondrate people in Lithuania. But Russians in Snieckus argue that they came here more than ready to do their best in creating a new power industry in Lithuania. Only quite recently did they find out about the categoric refusal of the Lithuanian scientific community to have a nuclear power station built in the heart of Lithuania's national park. The majority of the Russians in Snieckus agree that the demands put forth by the Lithuanian public to put a stop to the expansion of the nuclear power plant, which actually was done several months ago, were more than rightful. However, very few people in Snieckus can speak Lithuanian or know anything about its history. Quite naturally the wave of national rebirth that has swept over Lithuania seems to them to be like the ravings of a delirious person. Those people who have settled down in Snieckus have never even dreamt of living in a democracy, the more so that not only themselves, but their parents and grandparents were born into a world of dogmas. Lithuania understands this well and is looking for ways how to cure this bleeding wound of the stagnation era.

The fact that such wounds will take quite a long time to heal can be proved by a conversation I had with a highly placed official at the Snieckus nuclear power plant. Hardworking and honest, the Siberian man who has been living in Lithuania for several years now, could not tell me what concretely gave him grounds for concern in present day Lithuania. Finally, when I actually asked him bluntly to give me the real facts he said, searching hard for the correct words, that these days you seldom could hear the honorific title comrade in Lithuania. According to him some LIthuanian magazines even rejected the word Soviet in their titles. What else? Well, nothing really. So do you see the seriousness of the problem? Maybe after all we will succeed in healing this festering wound in Lithuania. Isn't it funny to speak of tensions on the interethnic level if the only argumentation for this are reasons similar to those put forward by the boss I spoke to? Meanwhile the nationality question is still an open one, giving many grounds for deep

concern and anxiety. Some time ago about 10 families left Snieckus for good, explaining that it was better to take to one's heels before it was too late, and there is no sign that this psychosis will die down soon. As I was told by the manager of the nuclear power plant, many more families have expressed their determination to move out of Snieckus. This dirty work is not only the result of the heightened activities of present day provocateurs, it is also the direct consequence of those who masterminded the cunning schemes of assimilating nations so that they would lose their individuality and uniqueness and thus, as a large grey mass, march toward communism. Only today have we realized with a start that we have been moving in absolutely the wrong direction.

Conference Seeks 'Justice' for Soviet Germans

PM2306123589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Conference Held"]

[Text] Alma-Ata, 21 Jun—The work of the republic-level scientific-practical conference "Germans in the Fraternal Family of Soviet Peoples," which has come to a close in Alma-Ata, was imbued with deep, sincere concern for the fate of Soviet Germans and the restoration of historical justice to them after their unwarranted deportation from their homes during the Stalin years. There was an interested, meaningful discussion about how to speed up the solution of the difficult problems concerning many representatives of this nationality.

The following took part: Scientists, writers and journalists, figures in the cultural and arts world, party, soviet, and economic workers, leading production workers, and numerous guests from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR), the Ukraine, the Central Asian republics, and the GDR and the FRG.

The conference comprehensively discussed various stages in the history of the Soviet Germans and their place and role in the present-day structure and life of our multiethnic country and in the developing processes of restructuring. It analyzed the present state and possibilities for the development of German language, culture, and art, and original traditions and customs and the questions of setting up a national school and training the scientific, technical, and creative intelligentsia.

The participants in the conference made specific proposals to improve the entire complex of interethnic relations and solve topical problems affecting Soviet Germans—primarily those such as the question of autonomy, efforts to overcome emigration trends, and reinforceing the policy of encouragement in the cultural sphere.

Ambassador Shikin Views Restructuring at Home

AU2306091389 Vienna KURIER in German 23 Jun 89 p 3

[Otto Klambauer report on an interview with Gennadiy Shikin, Soviet ambassador to Austria, by KURIER: "Soviet Ambassador: 'Perestroyka Is in Very Decisive Phase'"]

[Text] "We are in quite a serious situation—however, we cannot master it if we devote our attention to any kind of Cassandra's warnings." That is how Gennadiy Shikin, Soviet ambassador to Austria, comments on Sakharov's warnings in a KURIER interview. He said that restructuring (perestroyka) was in a "very decisive phase." "Of course, nobody is satisfied with the current situation—neither with the supply situation, nor with the social situation of some sectors, nor with agriculture, nor with the pace of reforms," stresses Shikin. "There is considerable dissatisfaction," he said, adding, however, that it would not be possible to push perestroyka, if we constantly listened to such voices. He said that it was gradually about time for Gorbachev to put an end to such rumors.

Shikin said that regarding the nationalities crisis, we should not "lump every case of unrest together," because there were religious as well as nationalities conflicts, but also "cases of mere crime." Commenting on this, Shikin said: "There is opposition by people who profited from the old system ... corrupt people. They must be punished."

Georgian Radio Begins Greek Broadcasts

LD2206135689 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Tbilisi June 22 TASS—By TASS correspondent Rimma Shevchenko:

Georgian radio has begun broadcasting in the Greek language for the 100,000 Greeks residing in this transcaucasian repulic, thus making Greek the 8th broadcast language.

Greeks first appeared in Georgia late in the 18th century under the rule of Tsar Irakliy. Mass migration began early in the 19th century.

A Greek language and literature faculty was opened two years ago at Tbilisi University to train teachers for sixty Georgian schools, where Greek is studied.

Soviet Writers To Publish 'The Gulag Archipelago'

AU0207175589 Paris AFP in English 1727 GMT 2 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, July 2 (AFP)—The Union of Soviet writers has decided to publish "The Gulag Archipelago" in the Soviet Union and will ask that the book's author, Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, be admitted to the organization, an associate of the dissident writer said here Sunday.

The decision to publish the book and to ask the Soviet parliament to reconsider a decision depriving Mr. Solzhenitsyn of Soviet citizenship was taken by the group's secretariat and was unanimous, according to Vadim Borisov, who oversees Mr. Solzhenitsyn's interests in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Solzhenitsyn was exiled after writing the book, which described the horrors of life in Soviet prison camps, and has lived mostly in the United States since 1974.

New Book on History of Orthodox Church Reviewed

PM2206104589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[Book review by Doctor of Historical Sciences Prof A.N. Sakharov under the rubric "Books": "Long Silence Broken"]

[Text] The book "Russian Orthodox Church: Landmarks in History" (Footnote) ("Russian Orthodox Church: Landmarks in History" [Russkoye Pravoslaviye: Vekhi Istorii], Moscow, 1989, 720 pages), recently published by the Political Literature Publishing House, is the first general work on the history of the Russian church to have been published in the last 20 years or more.

Its publication is very significant. It is the result of the general turn by Soviet social sciences toward real historical dialectics and of the rejection of the rigid, dogmatic approaches in whose meshes many major research subjects were helplessly flailing.

How truthful and profound is this scientific work and how far does it dialectically reflect the history of such a complex, contradictory social organism as the Russian Orthodox Church? The answer is not as simple as one would like. One thing is beyond doubt: This new general work goes far beyond the flat, hackneyed, antireligious, antichurch works of the past.

Essentially covering the entire history of the Russian Orthodox Church from the 10th century to the present day, the book illuminates various aspects of relations between the church and society. It examines the evolution of relations between the church and the state and between the church and the people over the ages, the church's place in the system of socioeconomic relations, and its role in the development of Russia's culture and spiritual potential; it also reveals the international status of the church and its international ties at various stages in the country's history. The clergy is described as a multilayered, highly contradictory social organism whose individual parts have been oriented toward different social forces over the centuries. The book is packed with a wealth of factual material, some of which is being brought into scientific circulation for the first time.

An important point is that the history of the church is assessed in all its social relationships and in a specific historical way. The deeply contradictory relations between the church and the state in the 10th-16th centuries are revealing: The church is objectively described as a developing, strengthening institution full of progressive social impulses in various spheres of life; from the 17th century it begins to lag behind social needs, gradually becoming a brake on social development, particularly in the spiritual sphere; it develops into an obscurantist, isolationist institution. At every stage the book illustrates the church's unquestioned embodiment of both positive and braking forces, which cause its position to oscillate on the scales of history. This is the first time a book has so clearly depicted the patriotic role of the church, particularly in such extreme periods of Russian history as the "Time of Troubles," the Patriotic War of 1812, and the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878.

The book gives a convincing picture of how the church developed into an openly counterrevolutionary force during the three Russian revolutions and of its agonizing crisis at the beginning of the 20th century, its endeavors to adapt to the conditions of Soviet society, and its gradual transition to loyalty and even cooperation with the Soviet state, which was particularly apparent during the Great Patriotic War. The final sections of the book illustrate the contemporary state of the Russian Orthodox Church, which in recent years has firmly found its place in Soviet society.

Nevertheless, the book leaves a considerable number of unanswered questions, which is perfectly natural in present conditions, when real life and social consciousness are developing at a considerably faster pace than the scientific interpretation of these processes.

We are still afraid to admit that at every stage in our history the church has been not simply a class force and not simply the "opium" of the people but has had a very strong influence on people's hearts and souls and, through its best representatives, has appealed to the "human side of man"; precisely this struggle against man's alienation from society has to a great extent helped it to assert and preserve itself.

Turning to the Soviet era, we still do not risk honestly showing the real relationship between church and state in the twenties and thirties. The sharp decline in the role of the church in society was caused not only by objective factors (which is well discussed in the book) but also by the most brutal repressions and real devastation of the church and its cadres. The fate of the church has been closely interwoven with the fate of the country and the people.

Many of these and other unanswered questions are quite rightly raised in the epilogue to the book. It is up to the historians to provide the answers.

Local Paper Foretold Bashkir Pipeline Explosion

18290208 Moscow TRUD in Russian 16 Jun 89 p 3

[Article by R. Abdullin, S. Mostovshchikov, special TRUD correspondents, Ufa-Moscow, under the rubric "Something to Think About": "What Happened at Ufa?"]

[Text] **On 30 May 1989, SVET OKTYABRYA, the Iglinskiy Rayon newspaper of Bashkiriya, together with an announcement of the loss of a light bay mare and a notice about the loss of a certificate of advanced driver qualifications, published a public appeal by the Administration of the Ural-Siberian Main Oil Pipeline to the population of the rayon. It reported that there was a potential for accidents on the liquified gas pipeline that ran through the territory of the rayon. In several days, an appalling catastrophe occurred here that had no equal. Everything happened, as if according to a scenario, virtually in complete conformity with the text of the published article....**

It is very difficult to reach final conclusions and to explain the causes of the explosion in simple terms before the official announcement of the findings of the governmental commission is made. Diametrically opposed data are already appearing in the talks of various specialists and a number of publications. Some say that the smell of gas could be picked up in the locality before the accident; others assert that there was nothing of the kind. Some are refuting the first report that, on the day before, the pressure in the petroleum-product pipeline system dropped and that the pumping station that noticed this "pushed up" the pressure of the liquified gas.

We will hope that the truth, nonetheless, will become known. All of the documentation associated with the pipeline and its operation, and explanatory notes of a number of officials, will be collated by the commission and integrated. In the meantime, it can be said with confidence only that what happened was not sabotage. This was asserted by the chairman of the USSR KGB to the governmental commission. It is known that a break occurred in the pipe as a result of a brittle rupture of the metal. This could have happened either because of a cooling in a part of the pipe, that is, because of leakage, or because of a powerful hydraulic shock. Such a version is also justifiable, inasmuch as the pipeline was idle the day before and the operational pressure was given only several hours before the accident. During that time, while the system was under low pressure, a gas "lock" from the evaporating product could have occurred at raised spots along the line. Upon coming out at operational pressure, it could have moved along the pipe, carrying the danger.

It seems that we will soon be given the specific causes, and the names of those against whom criminal proceedings will be instituted. However, it is considerably more complicated then finding the guilty parties to answer the question: How could this happen at all?

We will give the reader an opportunity to get acquainted with the text of the appeal of the Administration of the Ural-Siberian Main Oil Pipeline which we mentioned at the beginning. We present it with a slight abridgement:

"The Administration... gives notice to the population, kolkhozes [collective farms], sovkhozes [state farms], and all residents of the rayon that a main liquified gas pipeline, through which a hazardous, explosible, inflammable, and highly toxic liquified hydrocarbon gas is pumped under high pressure, passes near settlements at stations Kazayak, Ulu-Telyak (The accident occurred between these stations—authors' note), Minzitarovo, and Tavtimanovo.

"A break in the pressurized main pipeline or its equipment CAN (abridged from this point on—authors) lead to an accident with grave consequences. Liquified gas, spreading out in the area like conventional liquid, forms a light cloud that does not easily disperse in the air and that blankets the ground. It spreads over a large distance and accumulates in low spots. Therefore, an explosion and burning of the escaped liquified gas are POSSIBLE from a source of fire that is located at a considerable distance from the scene of the accident.

"An explosion and a resulting fire COULD lead to the death and injury of people in the area of the accident and to the destruction of nearby industrial and residential buildings with huge material losses.

"The high temperature of the flames, even at a long distance, can cause serious burns. Vaporization of the liquified gas has a damaging effect on human skin, causing skin problems (eczema and the like). It is especially dangerous when they get into the mucous membranes of the eyes and mouth...

"On finding the characteristic symptoms of the escape of liquified gas... immediately inform the local soviet of people's deputies for notification of industrial, roadway, and agricultural enterprises located in the accident area and, through the nearest communications center, notify the enterprise that operates the main liquified gas pipeline..."

When we accidentally came across this notice, frankly speaking, we became frightened. Not because, this kind of text, as it turned out, was published every month in the newspaper during the last more than 2 years and which, as the cruel irony of fate would have it, appeared again just several days before the catastrophe. Not because it indicates the complete helplessness of the operators, who are not in a position to establish the site of an accident in a timely way and then and there eliminate it, making it safe for the population. It became frightening, because the possibility of a catastrophe with grave consequences was not eliminated initially. It was

not eliminated despite the fact that since 1985—the time the petroleum pipeline went into operation—there were already more than 40 accidents on it, of course, of a lesser force.

How can this be explained? The commission has already expressed its attitude in a preliminary way: it is, as always the case in similar tragic incidents, bad management and negligence. It is possible that this is indeed so. Even very likely. Only, if bad management is also the verdict, then the verdict most likely is "not guilty." The one-time nature of this notion makes it possible to console onself with the illusion that what occurred was a coincidence.

We visited the "Ulu-Telyak" oil-pumping station, which is responsible for the operation of a 70-kilometer stretch of the pipeline on which the accident occurred. Chief of the NPS [oil-pumping station] Ibragimov said that he remembers how the gasline was being constructed. The builders pushed the pipes into trenches with an excavator and other equipment that was not suitable for the work. Ibragimov himself saw numerous dents and scratches on the pipes, each of which could later cause a gas leakage. The customer, the Almetyevsk gas refining plant, did not look into this and accepted the pipe from the builder.

Deficiencies in operation? What kinds of deficiencies? Up until 1987, his NPS did not operate the petroleum pipeline—the plant did this. And afterwards the pipe was excavated by the oil distillers. How can you look after it? In September of 1987 there were personnel reductions—well, they eliminated six pipeline inspectors who previously checked on the condition of the mainline twice a day. And if this had not happened, then, perhaps...

But here is the opinion of another specialist—Mukhamedov, deputy chairman of the USSR Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises, who at one time worked in Bashkiriya and who had a direct connection with the construction of petroleum pipelines.

"Now you are beginning to understand a lot," he told us. "No one in the world builds gas pipelines of such a length from pipes with such a diameter. These are diameters of 700 millimeters, and, there, 300 and 400 is the maximum."

In other words, in the case under consideration, we have numerous conditions that could have occurred at some time and, very likely, nothing would have happened. The question is not one of details and not one of specific culprits. One has to find the courage and say to oneself: It could not have been otherwise. This accident was bound to happen. Especially since the system of inspection of the work of the pipeline and the system for protecting it are so imperfect that they give no guarantee of safety.

The conclusions of all specialists, without exception, are as follows: the "world's biggest" gas pipeline cannot be operated in this condition. Indeed, even the Almetyevsk GPZ [oil-refining plant], as it turns out, does not object. But how many other pipelines do we have in the country? Who can vouch for them now? We are not in favor of banning them also. But there must be a ban on living this way. Living and working and virtually digging one's own grave, unfortunately, not in a figurative sense.

Latvian Official on Riga Fire Investigation

PM2306102989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent I. Litvinova report: "'VEF': The Causes of the Fire Are Being Established"]

[Text] Riga—The fire at Riga's "VEF" Production Association must not upset the enterprise's work. O. Misurkin, first deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, comments on the situation.

[Misurkin] Approximately 6,500 square meters of production premises suffered as a result of the fire; the machine and power-engineering shops, where 4,500 square meters were damaged, came out the worst. We have lost 1,500 workplaces as a result of the fire. "VEF" itself allocated premises the next day for employees from the afflicted buildings and they have gotten down to work. Some of the "VEF" workers will be working on a third shift for the time being and some will begin assembling centers for "VEF" output at the "Kommutator" and "Radiotekhnika" production associations, making fuller use of the "VEF" subsidiary. We do not want enterprises linked with "VEF" by agreements to panic. We estimate a 10-15 and 10 percent fall in output, in June and July respectively, as a result of the fire while we aim to return to plan figures as of August. We are increasing certain targets to compensate for the losses.

The investigation group is continuing its work. Ideas on the causes of the fire are being elaborated. Only the source of the conflagration has hitherto been established, namely the roof of the "VEF" second block. Repair work was under way here a few days before the fire.

Yakovlev Addresses Workers on Restructuring

LD2306013489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 22 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Comrades, a report has just come in on Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev's visit to the Leninist Komsomol motor vehicle works.

Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev acquainted himself with the sections and took an interest in the production problems linked to the new Moskvich model and the

workers' working conditions. Afterward, a meeting with the enterprise's labor collective took place at the house of culture of the motor vehicle works.

In his speech, Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev noted that one of the most important tasks of restructuring is the revival of human morality, ethical norms, honesty, and probity, without which all material riches turn man into just a consumer of goods, not a bearer and creator of spiritual principles. Restructuring is the demolition of the economic and political structure which was created over decades and allocated to the individual the role of building material from which anything at all could be molded, neglecting his interests and hopes in the process. Restructuring is a vision of our life in a real light, according to genuine, not artificial, values, where white is called white and black is called black everywhere, in everything and at all levels.

Finally, Comrade Yakovlev stressed, restructuring is a resolute break with the ideas and the psychology where some people put their trust in a sagacious leader sitting on high, who sees, understands, and decides everything, and, expecting that abundance, do not themselves trouble their reason or their souls; and others, on various rungs of the administrative ladder, and with varying degrees of narcissism and conceit, have endowed themselves with those very qualities and omnipotence, considering their administrators' chairs an impregnable fortress and regarding an encroachment on it as worse than an encroachment on the social system. Yes, Comrade Yakovlev said, conditions have changed, but the psychology and the organization of public life have, in many respects, remained the same. We carried on and are still carrying on living and moving, in many respects, by inertia. This is why the need for profound political reform is sensed more and more acutely. The first USSR Congress of People's Deputies had something to say here. It was also a visible break with the old psychlogy of self-abasement, a powerful factor for the irreversibility of restructuring and its accelerator.

After the speech, Alekskandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev answered questions from the workers:

[Begin Yakovlev recording] Research—That is one question. And this question must be asked in specific terms. You know, until a certain moment I also believed that we are probably spending too much money on space research. But there is the story with this plan, when very serious technological things come to light which can be transferred to the civilian sector, or it is possible there, say, to solve simply the telephonization of the whole world with our assistance—well, of course, as for how we will do this, all that still has to be discussed and discussed: I am simply telling you, in principle, that some kinds of advantages emerge for civilian industry, that perhaps a little will have to...strictly speaking, in my opinion, and it could be reviewed, although I am not yet certain of it. You know, I see the problem here lying somewhere else. The problem lies, I think, in our internal COCOM [Coordinating Committee on Export Controls], in our internal barriers between military, defense, and civilian industry. The problem lies, I think, in our internal COCOM, in our internal barriers between military, defense, and civilian industry. [repetition of preceding sentence as heard] The world has long been free of that. But in this country the closed nature and the secrecy of the defense sector, in general, to put it mildly, do not provide benefits. We ought to arrange things so that whatever is not an absolute military secret is all transferred simultaneously to the civilian sector. After all, the military industry is a very enormous scientific research potential—institutes, scientists, the intellectual elite of our science, and so on and so forth.

So, it should be arranged that it can work for both military and civilian industry at once. Then, we will probably not have such issues or they will be less acute, since all this will be justified by the work of civilian industry as well. Well, the comrades who are involved in this business are now dealing with these matters, and some kind of measures will probably be undertaken in this regard too, from the angle, simply, of what is sensible and the point of view of common sense. [video shows Yakovlev addressing meeting in an assembly hall] [end recording]

Technical Norms To Be Adjusted to German Norms

AU2306115589 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 23 Jun 89 p 29

["Xs" report: "Soviet Union Adjust Technical Norms"]

[Text] Stuttgart—The USSR intends to adjust two-thirds of its technical norms to the DIN [German Industrial Norms] norms by 1993, because the Soviet economy wants to adjust to the single European market. This was stated by Aleksandr Kamenev at the opening of the "Days of USSR Machine-Building" in Stuttgart. The first deputy chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology said that the agreement concluded during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit set the switches for direct contacts between German and Soviet enterprises. The USSR machine-building enterprises also want to export machine tools and machine parts directly to the FRG, but they are mainly interested in cooperation with FRG machine-tool producers in order to thus raise mutual deliveries, Kamenev said. Last year the Baden-Wuerttemberg companies increased their exports to the Soviet Union by 55 percent to DM1.5 billion—to 1.5 percent of the country's total exports.

6th Edition of Party Journal Outlined

PM2306085189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Latest Edition of IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS"]

[Text] The sixth edition of the journal IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS opens with a section entitled "At the CPSU Central Committee." It acquaints us with the Central

Committee's work in May 1989. The following are published in it: a Politburo resolution on questions of increasing the effectiveness of capital investments and improving the economic mechanism in construction; a Central Committee Secretariat resolution on coverage of the life and activity of the USSR Armed Forces in the central press, and other documents.

The edition carries brief biographies of 109 candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee and 70 members of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission.

The journal talks about the sittings of the CPSU Central Committee commissions. They discussed ideological problems of interethnic relations, the draft USSR Law "On Freedom of Religion and Religious Organizations," ways of improving the economic mechanism in construction, and proposals regarding the elaboration of a statewide program to fight crime.

It gives a detailed report from the Central Committee Administration of Affairs on the use of the CPSU budget for 1988 and a report on the discussion of this question at the sitting of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission. Last year 35 party organizations (6 more than in 1987) financed their expenditure using their own income and made payments into the party budget, while 51 organizations obtained subsidies from the CPSU budget.

The press has already reported on the examination carried out by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo commissions of the case of the so-called "Marxist-Leninist Union" (1932-1933) and the rehabilitation of M.N. Ryutin into the party. The edition provides detailed articles on this matter prepared by the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee and the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism Institute.

The section "CPSU International Ties" publishes a program for ideological cooperation between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. It also includes a chronicle of talks, conversations, and meetings held in May 1989 and biographical information on V. Teitelboim, general secretary of the Communist Party of Chil, and M. Pancevski, chairman of the LCY [League of Communists of Yugoslavia] Central Committee Presidium.

The "CPSU Central Committee Mailbag" rubric is represented by letters from workers at the Belov city party committee, Kemerovo Oblast; S.Ye. Matafonov, a delegate to the 19th party conference; and also two letters from the past —from 1956 and 1967.

The readers' attention is also drawn to the archive section of the journal. The chronicle of Central Committee activity in the period September 1918-January 1919 occupies center stage here. Many documents incorporated in the chronicle, including protocols of sittings of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee Central Committee, Central Committee Bureau, and Organizational Bureau are published for the first time.

The section continues G.Ye. Zinovyev's memoirs talking about the dramatic events in the life of the Bolshevik Party linked with the infiltration of R.V. Malinovskiy, a czarist secret police informant, into the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party Central Committee. Little-known documents and photographs are published.

The "From the History of Collectivization" rubric carries A.V. Chayanov's notes on the state of USSR agriculture in the mid-twenties, compiled in 1927 on the instructions of the Central Committee Politburo for the 15th All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Congress. The archive section closes with a review of the fifth edition of IZVESTIYA TSK RKP [Russian Communist Party] (Bolsheviks) for 1919.

Economic

USSR Foreign Economic Program Criticized

18250184 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Igor Valentinovich Machilskiy, general director of the Association of Business Cooperation with the FRG ("Ratmir"), by IZVESTIYA correspondent B. Lysenko: "Obstacles We Create for Ourselves on the Foreign Economic Market"; date, place not specified; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] **IZVESTIYA continues to receive letters that express doubts and objections concerning the advisability of introducing a series of restrictions for Soviet enterprises, organizations, and production cooperatives in the area of foreign economic activity. In this connection, our correspondent met with the manager of one of the departmental foreign economic organizations of the USSR—Igor Valentinovich Machilskiy, the general director of the Association of Business Cooperation with the FRG ("Ratmir").**

[Lysenko] Most of the questions and unfavorable criticism concerning the resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers "On the Measures of State Regulation of Foreign Economic Activity," are associated with the transfer of the right of licensing export-import operations to industrial ministries and departments. How would you comment on this situation?

[Machilskiy] Narrow departmentalism is not so much a chronic illness as a real problem for our entire economy, including the area of foreign economic relations. As a rule, it is directed at the protection of group interests of branch monopolies, and not the entire USSR economy.

The mass media has repeatedly cited examples of precisely this departmental approach to public interests. For example, a lively discussion is going on now about the

reaction of the Minrybkhoz [Ministry of the Fishing Industry] to the independent action of one of its Far Eastern subdivisions; in another case, nonprofessionalism in the foreign economic area of departmental subdivisions of the Minkultura [Ministry of Culture], however paradoxical this may seem, serves as a basis for attempts at strengthening the monopoly of the apparatus of the ministry.

All activity of the departments is directed at the fulfillment of planned indices, according to which they render accounts to the directive organs. Thus, the Minlesprom [Ministry of the Timber Industry] is not very likely to agree to the issuance of a license to "foreign" enterprises, being itself drawn into plans for the export of forest products. And so the country has to reconcile itself to the fact that the department sells raw materials and that we have to import the articles that are manufactured from them, including high-quality furniture and wood for musical instruments, etc.

[Lysenko] But regarding the relatively new Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, apparently, it represents the interests of our state?

[Machilskiy] Under conditions of an administrative-command economy, it is simply not able to "overcome itself" to make public interests paramount. And it turned into a common "agent" of Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] for material and technical balancing of the shortfalls in the national economy by resorting to the foreign market. Many articles and goods are not produced in our country only because they do not fall within the sphere of the interests of departments, although there is an objective requirement for them. Meanwhile, the acceleration of scientific-technical progress in the entire world is expanding the list of such items.

We thereby ourselves become passive participants in the international division of labor, acquiring only some kind of insignificant part of the achievements of world progress. And at the same time, we are not selling in a practical way on world markets even those achievements that we have, because production in all branches is planned in a strictly "balanced way" by the departments. In these circumstances, the MVES [Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations] is attempting as quickly as possible "to render an account" of the obligations that have been placed on it. The role of a "helmsman" of the economy of our country in the "ocean of the world economy" is absolutely foreign to it..

[Lysenko] What kinds of measures could help MVES assume the role of this "helmsman?"

[Machilskiy] If the MVES was relieved of the fulfillment of import-export plans and it was given the status of an organizer, coordinator, and controller of all foreign economic activity in the country, and also the role of a "state arbiter" in the foreign economic area. Then licensing by this department could be welcome, because the MVES would be compelled to be guided by national economic interests, rendering acounts to the government and the USSR Supreme Soviet in the process.

But even in this case, licensing as a measure for regulating foreign economic relations constitutes a temporary necessary step to the full completion of economic reform in the national economy of the USSR. Then the command-administrative method of regulation will give way to principally economic methods. Only then will customs duties, taxation, loan interest, and a real ruble rate of exchange, and not some department, determine what kind of commodities it is profitable for the producer in the USSR to export, and what kind to import. Moreover, it will become self-evident that the export of the gifts of nature, i.e., raw materials in the form of oil, gas, round timber, ores, etc, is not economically profitable, but that what is more profitable is the export of products of labor, i.e., finished products with a high degree of processing.

[Lysenko] Existing practice permits the departments to dictate the norms of hard currency deductions for organizations and enterprises in their system. Is this necessary and is it possible to avoid this?

[Machilskiy] It is necessary to regulate the norms of hard currency deductions from the export activity of participants in the foreign economic process. First of all, they should not have a departmental character. Now, for example, the same bolts, exported, let us say, at the same contract price by enterprises in different departments, bring different hard currency proceeds to these enterprises. Thus, enterprises of the Minavtoselkhozmash [Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building] should deduct 30 percent of hard currency earnings in the central fund, enterprises of Mintyazhmash [Ministry of Heavy, Power, and Transport Machine Building]—40 percent, and Minstankoprom [Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry]—50 percent, etc. Some of the enterprises, in order to lower the share of payments to the central fund of their ministries, export products with the help of enterprises of other ministries, where payments to the central fund are set at lower scales. The departmental character of setting deduction norms does not make it possible to introduce a policy of state priorities through economic methods.

Also important is the procedure for distributing hard currency proceeds along the technological chain of participants in the manufacture of a commodity. Now almost all proceeds (if there are any) show up at the final supplier of the commodity. But this problem can be regulated economically by stimulating the export activity not only of the final supplier for export, but all participants in the chain, including the supplier of raw materials. For this it is necessary to introduce norms for deductions from hard currency proceeds on the added value of production or services (for example, transport, engineering, etc) of each subsupplier. The final supplier

of the commodity, who is responsible for warranties to the foreign buyer must, naturally, receive a big part of the proceeds, but not all. In the process, it would also be expedient if each subsupplier would pay a specific percentage of received hard currency proceeds to funds of local soviets. Then there would be an interest in export potential along the entire technological chain of one or another export commodity.

A decree of the USSR Council of Ministers of 2 December of last year declared the right of practically all Soviet enterprises, organizations, and producer cooperatives, capable of coming out with competitive commodities, to enter the foreign market. However, in practice they run into unforseen difficulties that are associated, in particular, with opening and maintaining their hard currency accounts. How do you view these difficulties?

[Machilskiy] Soon after the issuance of the decree of the USSR Council of Ministers of 7 March 1989 "Concerning Measures of State Regulation of Foreign Economic Activity," the Vneshekonombank [Bank for Foreign Economic Activity] published a temporary instruction dated 27 March 1989 No 5 concerning the procedure for opening and maintaining foreign currency accounts of enterprises, organizations, and cooperatives.

This wordy document, of course, deserves serious analysis and verification in practice. That the Vneshekonombank opens outside balance and current currency accounts that their owners cannot use freely (before the execution of an operation with these accounts, justifiable reasons are required—decisions of higher organs), is the only thing that indicates that this instruction greatly distinguishes the activity of the Vneshekonombank in the operation of currency accounts from world practice. In addition, the bank can change the system of accounts on its own. In other words, it can decide itself what kind of operations can be conducted by one or another account, and what kind cannot be. Such a position for the owner of an account, who is doomed to numerous coordination actions for his operations, in addition to other authorities, and yet with the bank—is an additional restriction on his activities. The use of only current account balances for the indicated purposes would significantly simplify the accounting procedure and the use of foreign currency.

Excessive controls (account owners are checked repeatedly before conducting banking operations) under conditions of virtually full "manual" work by bank employees only aggravate the sluggishness in foreign economic operations.

And even witout this, all of our economic activity is permeated with various coordinations, controlled operations, and approval by various authorities, which causes slowness and a kind of brake on the economic activity of enterprise-producers. And then there is also the bank, which, after being called on to be the executor of client instructions in accordance with currency legislation, took on the functions of the Minfin [Ministry of Finance] for controlling the operations of account owners.

The monopoly of Vneshekonombank in introducing operations in foreign currency does not allow Soviet enterprises and organizations to seek the services of other banks, and this does not help healthy competition in the fight for clients, and it does not promote an increase in the qualitative level of service by the Vneshekonombank. In return, the indicated monopoly gives the Vneshekonombank an unconditional right to collect commission fees from clients that are sometimes not justifiable for many operations.

[Lysenko] What is the solution?

[Machilskiy] The formation of the Vneshekonombank as an active assistant to all participants in the foreign economic process will take place only when it puts into practice in the internal currency turnover those norms, rates, tariffs, and operations that are applied throughout the world. In the process, it must free itself of the necessity of implementing monitoring-inspection supervision over the commercial activity of owners of hard currency accounts. Especially as, in principle, there are plenty of controllers as it is.

Scientific

'Cosmos-2029' Satellite Launched 5 Jul

LD0607072689 Moscow TASS in English 0718 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—The "Soyuz" booster rocket on Wednesday propelled into space an artificial earth satellite, "Cosmos-2029," next in the series, in the USSR. It carries scientific equipment to continue the exploration of the earth's natural resources in the interests of various branches of the national economy and international cooperation.

The satellite was put into an orbit with the following parameters:

—Initial period of revolution—88.8 minutes
—Maximum distance from the earth's surface—270 kilometers
—Minimum distance from the earth's surface—193 kilometers
—Orbit inclination—82.3 degrees.

The satellite also carries a radio system to accurately measure the orbit's elements and a radio-telemetric system to transmit to the earth data on the operation of instruments and scientific equipment.

The equipment installed in the satellite operates normally.

Military

Yazov Speaks to Military Academy Graduates

PM0507123189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jul 89 First Edition pp 1, 2

[Unattributed report: "Instructions From Party and People. Kremlin Reception in Honor of Military Academy Graduates"]

[Text] An elated, festive atmosphere reigned yesterday in the auditoriums of the Grand Kremlin Palace. They were the scene of a reception in honor of graduates of military academies held by the USSR Defense Ministry and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

The following met with the military academy graduates: Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister; O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; O.S. Belyakov, chief of a CPSU Central Committee department; A.N. Soshnikov, first deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee department; Army General P.G. Lushev, and Army General K.A. Kochetov, USSR first deputy defense ministers; Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; leaders of a number of ministries and departments; USSR deputy defense ministers; and military leaders. The reception was attended by generals, admirals, and officers of the USSR Armed Forces and the armies of the fraternal socialist countries and other friendly states who completed their training in Soviet military educational institutions and by academy professors and lecturers.

The reception was addressed by USSR Defense Minister Army General D.T. Yazov. You have completed your training and are being assigned to serve in the forces at an exceptionally crucial moment in the history of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community, he said in his address to the military academy graduates. Intensive work is under way to restructure Soviet society, renew socialism, comprehensively reveal its creative potential, and establish the new political thinking in international relations.

The revolutionary restructuring begun on the Communist Party's initiative has become the cause of the entire Soviet people. Their labor and their intellect and talents are carrying out the economic reform and the reconstruction of the political system and are laying the foundations of a rule-of-law state. Soviet man himself—working person and serviceman—is changing in the process of the transformation of all aspects of social life; his political and labor activeness and responsibility for the fate of the motherland are increasing.

The first Congress of USSR People's Deputies was the high point of restructuring and a major event in our country's political history. It cogently confirmed the correctness of the strategic course steered by the party in accordance with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th party conference. The full importance of the CPSU's consolidating role as the ruling party and as society's political vanguard was revealed with new force.

Profound restructuring processes are also developing within the Armed Forces—in their technical equipment, composition, structure, the training and education of personnel, and the activity of military cadres. Military academy graduates will have to, so to speak, join in these processes on the fly and head them in those sectors entrusted to them by the motherland. Broad scope for applying creativity, initiative, and the political and professional knowledge gained in the academies lies ahead.

Army General D.T. Yazov read out a greetings message from the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers. Expressing on behalf of everyone present cordial gratitude for the warm words of the message, the defense minister stressed that this document formulates the main instructions from the party and the people to our officer cadres—to ensure the successful solution of the practical tasks of restructuring Army and Navy life and worthily perform the sacred duty of defending peace and socialism and maintaining the Armed Forces in a state of high readiness to deal a guaranteed rebuff to aggression. He expressed the confidence that Soviet officers will honorably fulfill these instructions.

When they arrive in the forces and the fleets, Army General D.T. Yazov continued, academy graduates must immediately join most actively in work to explain the decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies as an epoch-making event in the life of the country on the road to real people's power. Here, he noted, it is important to affirm and uphold socialist ideals and values in a trenchant and well-reasoned manner and to ensure a solicitous attitude toward the legacy of the past, its best traditions, and state symbols and national shrines [svyatynya]. While developing the processes of democratization and glasnost in the Armed Forces in every possible way, it is necessary to persistently and purposefully strengthen one-man command on a party basis, conscious military discipline, and everyday regulation order. Personnel's growing political and service activeness must be channeled into the good-quality resolution of the tasks of combat readiness and operational and combat training and into eradicating shortcomings and negative phenomena in the forces' life and activity.

All those are essential, necessary preconditions for attaining the goals of the restructuring of the Armed Forces and imparting to them a new quality consonant with contemporary demands, the guidelines of our defensive doctrine, the principles of reasonable and reliable sufficiency, and loyalty to the combat alliance among the armies of the Warsaw Pact states. As active vehicles of party policy in the sphere of the country's defense and security, officers must convey to every serviceman the ideas and tenets of this policy. It is

designed to prevent war—both nuclear and conventional—and preserve universal peace. The fulfillment of this task is closely connected with defending the creative work of the Soviet people and the peoples of fraternal socialist countries.

Army General D.T. Yazov stressed that the need for this defense is objective. Despite the fact that international tension has now eased considerably, the reduction of nuclear arsenals has begun, and the negotiating process is gathering momentum, there are still no guarantees that the positive changes in the international arena are irreversible. In these conditions, as noted at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, "ensuring the reliable defense of the country is one of the most important functions of our state." The Congress spoke out in favor of the further qualitative development of the Soviet Army in line with the current principles of its formation. In gaining this new quality, our Armed Forces must become an increasingly flexible, well-coordinated, mobile fighting organism with a strong unity of views, will, and actions, furnished with the last word in science and technology, and based on comprehensive support from the people. Our experience of restructuring military life attests to ongoing progress in this direction. But it is not totally uniform. There are a considerable number of difficulties and problems and not every element of the braking mechanism has been eliminated. But there are also real, positive results in instruction, service, and the strengthening of discipline. They are increasing with every day.

The defense minister indicated that the main task of command-political cadres is to maintain the combat readiness of the Army and Navy at the proper level. And this must be done in the conditions of the extensive cuts in arms and Armed Forces and the radical changes—which have a defensive thrust—in groupings, in the manning levels and organizational structure, and the stationing of units and combined units. In addition to this, we have to restructure Soviet military science and, what is more, at a preferential pace, renew and enrich the theory of the art of war and the programs of military educational institutions, and bring into line with contemporary requirements the practice of training and educating personnel and party political work. The whole diverse, complex range of problems now facing command-political cadres in the Army and Navy can only be successfully resolved if in every subunit, unit, ship, and military collective there is an atmosphere of mutual exactingness and principle, responsibility and efficiency, and genuine Army and Navy comradeship. Only in this kind of atmosphere can the human factor be brought into play and fully realized—and it is the galvanization of this human factor that is essentially the main condition and guarantee of success of restructuring.

It is particularly important to bear this in mind when meeting the demand to ensure effective defense organizational development chiefly along qualitative parameters. After all, the term quality applied to military matters is essentially a strictly personal, human term. Any equipment, however powerful and sophisticated, is dead without a person to master it, without a professionally, morally, politically, and physically tempered serviceman. Even the most advanced postulates of the art of war and the most inventive methods of combat operations will remain mere theory if not put into practice by commanders and soldiers joined by unity of will and by the military collectives. And brilliant schemes are doomed to fail if there is not a high degree of organization and efficiency and if there is no strong military discipline.

That is why the individual must always be at the center of attention of command-political cadres and their daily activity and that is why an individual approach to instruction and education must be ensured. Great, fair demands on subordinates and tireless, meaningful concern for them is not only a statutory requirement. It is the vital credo of any Soviet officer. In the final analysis, the real officer is the one who achieves indissoluble spiritual closeness to his subordinates. It is this kind of commander and political worker they are prepared to follow through hell and high water. That has always been the case. But today, in the conditions of democratization and glasnost, this quality in an officer has assumed priority significance in the solution of all tasks facing the Armed Forces.

Real spiritual closeness, the defense minister continued, does not and cannot exist if the officer does not have unquestionable authority among his subordinates. On what is this authority based? It is based first and foremost on the officer's high level of professionalism. Within the walls of the academies, graduates acquire profound fundamental knowledge and certain practical skills in the leadership of units, ships, and combined units. But the academies are just one stage on the way to military expertise. Life does not stand still. Equipment and weapons are constantly becoming more sophisticated and the Armed Forces are equipped with high-precision military complexes and automated systems. The methods of combat operations are changing. Personnel is becoming different. All this must constantly be taken into consideration and people must resolve to work hard every day on themselves. However, even professionalism of the highest order is still only half of the equation. It will not have a proper effect if it is not underpinned and cemented by such qualities as strong will, the ability to assume responsibility, principle, decency, honesty, moral purity, and humanity. It is important to ensure that every commander, political worker, and officer-specialist meets the official requirements of his position and guarantees a qualitative solution to the tasks of combat readiness and combat and political training, and also a high degree of organization and military order. This order is achieved through a strong knowledge and strict, accurate fulfillment of the requirements of general military regulations and through painstaking instruction of people that is oriented toward an individual approach. It is necessary to improve the

effectiveness of party political work, which V.I. Lenin regarded as a powerful means of ensuring strong morale among the troops.

Today, Army General D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister, said in conclusion, it is important as never before to be specific: to consider the real processes taking place in the country, the Army, and the Navy, and to actively resolve the urgent problems of political, military, moral, patriotic, and international education for personnel and the problems of uniting multiethnic military collectives. The heart of all party political work must be to shape a communist philosophy and loyalty to the socialist motherland in servicemen. In united combat formation with the armies of the Warsaw Pact countries, the Soviet Armed Forces reliably protect the creative work of the fraternal peoples, as well as universal peace and security, and worthily fulfill their patriotic and international duty.

The reception was also addressed by Major General V. Isaychenkov, a graduate from the K.Ye. Voroshilov Military Academy of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces; Major A.M. Fernandez of the Cuban Revolutionary Armed Forces, a graduate from the V.I. Lenin Military-Political Academy; and Colonel Yu. Kulyukin, head of department at the Yu.A. Gagarin Air Force Academy.

Moiseyev Addresses General Staff Academy Graduates

PM0507131989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Graduation Ceremony at General Staff Academy"]

[Text] The latest student graduation ceremony has been held at the K.Ye. Voroshilov Military Academy of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff. The graduates were presented with diplomas and badges by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff.

He read the text of a greetings message from Army General D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, who warmly congratulated the academy graduates on the successful completion of their studies.

In his speech to the graduates, Army Gen M.A. Moiseyev described the military-political situation in the world and the confrontation between positive and negative trends in its development, emphasizing that it is the duty of academy graduates to get actively involved in work to implement the tasks facing the Soviet Armed Forces as regards ensuring defense building through qualitative parameters. He expressed confidence that the generals and officers who have graduated from the academy will dedicate all their energy, knowledge, and experience to the cause of further strengthening the defense might of the USSR and the socialist community countries and providing reliable protection of socialism and peace.

Akhromeyev Interviewed on New Job as Adviser

PM0407123189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Jul 89 First Edition p 2

[Interview in Moscow with Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev by special correspondent Lieutenant Colonel N. Belan under the new rubric "Portrait in the Light of Glasnost": "Adviser to the USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman"; date not given]

[Text] [Belan] Before our meeting today, Comrade Marshal of the Soviet Union, I happened to make the acquaintance of a former subordinate of yours—he served as a soldier in a tank regiment which you commanded. He very much wanted me to send you his regards...

[Akhromeyev] Thank you... When was that?... Some 35 years ago, in Maritime Kray, in the Far East...

[Belan] Therefore, Sergey Fedorovich, first of all a few questions of a personal nature—about your destiny, your family, and the range of your enthusiasms and interests.

[Akhromeyev] What of destiny? If I am alive, having fought from 1941 through 1945, and I am still serving, this means I have a good destiny. I have been in the Army since 1940. I began the war as an assistant platoon commander—at the time I was a cadet at the M.V. Frunze Naval School. In the summer of 1941 we cadets were fighting in the 3d Marines Brigade. From the fall of 1941 through January 1942—a very memorable time for me—I participated in the defense of Leningrad. In 1942 I was made an officer and I fought on the Stalingrad Front. Then on the Southern and 4th Ukrainian Fronts. After the war I graduated from the Armored Troops Military Academy and the General Staff Military Academy. I served among the troops in command and staff posts almost through the end of 1973, and then I was appointed to the General Staff. My family? I have a wife, two daughters, a grandson, and two granddaughters. I like to read in my free time. I am convinced that everyone must have a profound knowledge of his own people's culture. Without this he cannot be a real patriot of his homeland.

[Belan] Your present post was introduced recently. Why do you think precisely you were appointed to it?

[Akhromeyev] Evidently my work experience was taken into account when the decision was made to appoint me to the post of adviser to the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman. I have spent 49 years in the USSR Armed Forces, and for 15 of them I worked on the General Staff, where my chief duties throughout those years were to formulate the military-technical aspect of Soviet military doctrine and to elaborate questions of strategy and operational skill and the building and use of the Armed Forces. Throughout this time I also tackled the problem of the talks on reducing and limiting nuclear-space and conventional arms. Because of

serving on the General Staff, I knew political and military figures both in countries allied with us and in Western countries. I believe all this was taken into account when appointing me.

[Belan] About your new work. How is it organized? What questions have you resolved recently?

[Akhromeyev] It is organized, in principle, in just the same way a leader's work with those working under his command is always organized. I receive assignments and, where necessary, I show initiative in preparing materials on military-political questions—chiefly, the talks on reducing nuclear-space and conventional arms, which are particularly topical now. Of course, I help in the preparation of other materials too.

I must say that Mikhail Sergeyevich always sets tasks clearly and displays attention and patience in addition to high exactingness.

[Belan] Is your permanent place of work in the Kremlin? What apparatus of staffers does an adviser have? Do you have to involve generals and officers of the Ministry of Defense? How long is your workday?

[Akhromeyev] Yes, my permanent place of work is here, in the Kremlin, as you see it. (Sergey Fedorovich indicated with his hand the small, modestly furnished office.) I usually work from 0800 through 2000. If you consider that the normal workday on the General Staff was 15 hours, in this respect the load in my new job is somewhat less. My apparatus consists of two people. One helps to draw up the official materials which I prepare, while the other helps me to fulfill the duties of USSR people's deputy and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Since the range of my questions is chiefly of a military-political nature, I do, of course, work actively both with the Defense Ministry leadership and with other comrades.

[Belan] The Congress of USSR People's Deputies has taken place. Many people there spoke of the Armed Forces, sometimes in a sharp and very quick-tempered way. What is your attitude to the "military questions" raised at the Congress and to that way of formulating them?

[Akhromeyev] I will express my own personal and, possibly, debatable viewpoint. I am concerned at the fact that not all people's deputies fully understand at present the objective need for our Army and Navy to be at the appropriate qualitative level and to reliably ensure the country against aggression. Yes, tension in the world has diminished in the recent period. This is happening. This has chiefly made possible the reduction of the USSR Armed Forces by 500,000 men. But, even though it has diminished, this does not mean it has been totally eliminated, and the danger of war still remains for us and our allies. Since this is so, we objectively need armed forces of the appropriate quality. We must assess this sensibly and be aware of it.

The fact that other questions were raised at the Congress—about shortcomings in the state of combat readiness and military discipline—is, I would say, normal. The supreme organ of state power has the right to and must pose them in order to demand of the military leadership a better-quality resolution of them. Such exactingness will only benefit restructuring among the troops.

[Belan] You held the post of chief of General Staff when the decision was adopted on a unilateral reduction in our Armed Forces. How were the quantitative parameters of the reduction assessed, and why precisely 500,000 personnel and not, let us say, 300,000 or 700,000? That is, to what extent was everything reckoned up and weighed when adopting such a serious decision?

[Akhromeyev] First of all, the decision was prepared very carefully over several months. This question arose virtually as early as the summer of 1988, at the time when it became clearly apparent that military tension was falling and that the objective possibility of reducing the Armed Forces without damaging the country's defense capability had really emerged. As for the specific figure of 500,000, it was determined as the result of very great research and assessments of the military-political situation in the world. This decision was also made with due regard for the fact that we were withdrawing troops from Afghanistan. A number of other factors were also taken into account. Including our economic potential.

[Belan] Speaking at the Congress, you said that you carried out your military duty in Afghanistan for 2 and ½ years. In what capacity? What is your opinion of the expediency of sending our troops into Afghanistan? And is a repetition of the "Afghan situation" possible now?

[Akhromeyev] I served in Afghanistan in 1980-1981, and then paid periodic visits for the next 6 months. As first deputy chief of the General Staff at that time, I carried out the duties there of chief of the Defense Ministry Operational Group Staff headed by Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Sokolov. During this period the group organized combat operations, helped in the formation of the Afghan Armed Forces, and carried out many other duties in providing assistance to the Afghan political and military leadership. During this period the group's generals and officers together with the troops operated in literally all the republic's regions. This was difficult, to be blunt, front-line work... Many officers and generals are still serving who remember with gratitude the help and combat lessons they were taught by this group.

I would refrain from assessing just now the reasons for sending Soviet troops into Afghanistan. The Congress of People's Deputies has instructed the country's Supreme Soviet to make a political assessment of the decision to send Soviet troops to Afghanistan, so let's be patient and wait for the outcome. This document will probably also answer the question of the possibility of any repetition.

although I am sure that this is now ruled out. After all, such decisions have now become the prerogative of the USSR Supreme Soviet or even of the Congress of People's Deputies.

[Belan] Have you heard any opinions from Armed Forces personnel on what some people are calling a campaign aimed at belittling the prestige of the Army and military men? Have you put these matters to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet?

[Akhromeyev] Like many other servicemen I think that we are now hearing statements which defame military men, since the statements are unfair, unsubstantiated, and sometimes even offensive in form. They do not help to strengthen our defense capability. In part they arise from an erroneous assessment of the military-political situation in the world and from the fact that we have now allegedly reached a point where armies are becoming unnecessary. This opinion is fundamentally wrong. Nor, I think, is our defensive might served by the negative phenomena in the sphere of ethnic relations. For instance, what is the point in demanding that the Army be not a single organism but divided into units, destroying centralization in its building and leadership? Many people forget that the Armed Forces are a statewide and all-union body and serve the interests of the whole country and the whole Soviet people.

We are working on these and many other problems. First and foremost, of course, the leadership of the Defense Ministry and the Main Political Directorate are working on them. I work with them, insofar as I can. These matters will be put to our party and state leadership at an appropriate time and under the appropriate procedure. I recall that there was a recent CPSU Central Committee Secretariat resolution on this matter, it was published in the sixth issue of IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS.

[Belan] One last question. Many people—particularly those who, as the saying goes, still have their marshal's baton in their knapsack—have a great interest in people with careers such as yours. What would you wish young officers?

[Akhromeyev] I think that any person who makes the defense of the motherland his profession is not making a mistake. To be frank, I never planned to be an officer. There used to be an Institute of History, Philosophy, and Literature in Moscow. I'm a Muscovite and that's where I wanted to go. But the prewar situation forced another choice on me.

Like any other military man, my life and service have been hard. After the war I served in the most remote garrisons in the Far East. I only got a real apartment in 1960, when I became a divisional commander. I've had plenty of unpleasant experiences, injustices, and hard knocks in my career—like any other serving officer or general. But all this developed my character, determination, and realization that my subordinates' lives were also hard. The realization that tough exactingness should go hand in hand with humanity, that it is impossible to carry out a single mission without being concerned for soldiers, sergeants, officers, and generals, and without helping them. And I'd say one thing to all young people who are now making a career of the Army: You're right, I wish you success with all my heart.

Defense Ministry to Publish Draft Regulations

LD0307135389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1140 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Interview by unidentified TASS correspondent with Army General Valentin Varennikov, USSR deputy minister of defense; date and place not given]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Jul (TASS)—The Collegium of the USSR Defense Ministry has decided to publish the drafts of the interior service regulations, the disciplinary regulations, and the manual of garrison and guard duties of the Armed Forces of the USSR for broad discussion. In this connection, Army General Valentin Varennikov, USSR deputy minister of defense, chairman of the commission to draw up drafts of the general military regulations and commander in chief of land forces, told a TASS correspondent:

Revision of the regulations, which are the basic law-making and legal documents that govern the lifestyle of Army and Navy personnel, has become due because of the need to bring all their requirements fully into line with the changes that have taken place of late in the political structure and in the sociopolitical life of our society. As was once again emphasized at the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the Armed Forces are a part of the people, a child of the people. And it is only natural that the processes of restructuring, democratization, and glasnost should go deeper in them, just as they do in the country as a whole.

The draft of the interior service regulations clarifies the general rights and duties of servicemen in a move to reinforce the legal protection of the individual. In particular, it is envisaged that the bodies of state power, the heads of enterprises, institutions, and organizations, and the commanders of troop units should ensure that the rights and privileges laid down in legislation for servicemen and their families are implemented.

Also serving to protect the rights and dignity of military servicemen is the inclusion in the code of regulations of the requirements to fight insistently against violations of socialist legality, not to permit in relations with one's comrades conceit, rudeness, humiliation, and ridicule. In the event of the violation of the rules that have been set out by the code with regard to relationships, a military serviceman is obliged to take urgent measures for the regulations to be implemented and to report to his commander immediately. This provision will contribute to combating the disgraceful phenomenon of nonregulation relationships.

Considerable changes are being instituted in the sections dealing with obligations of commanders and chiefs. These include enhancing responsibility for the training and education of subordinates.

A most important duty of all commanders is the establishment of a close link between party and local soviet bodies, and collectives of the enterprises.

Everyone knows that military collectives are multiethnic. Often, representatives of ten or more nationalities serve in one company. This is why, in the list of obligations of a commander the following also appears: In leading a multiethnic colective, the principles of the Leninist national policy are to be followed rigorously, and special concern is to be shown to strengthening friendship and fraternity between troops of different nationalities.

The draft regulations will be published in the press in the middle of July. When they have been widely discussed the commission will publicize all the proposals. Then the drafts will be examined at the collegium of the USSR Defense Ministry and submitted to the Supreme Soviet for confirmation.

DOSAAF Head on Restructuring With Defense Cuts

LD0307205589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1133 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Interview by unidentified TASS correspondent with Colonel General Nikolay Kotlovtsev, USSR DOSAAF Central Committee chairman; date and place not given]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Jul (TASS)—"Preparing young people for service in the Army, Air Force and Navy remains one of the most important functions of the Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation and Navy (DOSAAF)," said Colonel General Nikolay Kotlovtsev, USSR DOSAAF Central Committee chairman. He was giving an interview to the TASS diplomatic correspondent in connection with the restructuring currently underway in the defense society, which was set up more than 70 years ago to prepare young people to defend their motherland.

Nikolay Kotlovtsev said that restructuring in the society's work is taking place in conditions when cuts are being made in the USSR in the Armed Forces and military expenditure, and a number of military programs are being reduced, in accordance with Soviet defense doctrine and the new model of security. But, the general remarked, the West has not yet taken similar steps. "In these conditions the role of the defense society, which numbers tens of millions of members in its ranks, is growing."

"Up to 2 million specialists in 140 professions are trained every year in teaching organizations, sports and technical clubs, in the grassroots DOSAAF organizations in industrial enterprises, and in state and collective farms. Special attention is paid to the training of cadres for the mass technical professions not only for the Army, but for the national economy too," Nikolay Kotlovtsev said.

Continued Reportage on Nuclear Submarine Accident

Further on Sub's Return to Base

18010731 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Jun 89 First Edition p 1

[Article by Capt 3d Rank P. Ishchenko: "Submarine Returns to Base".]

[Text] On 28 June, the SSN [nuclear-powered submarine] on which occurred the seal-failure in the first circuit of the nuclear reactor was towed by "Karabakh," a rescue ship of the Northern Fleet, to the outer roads of the base where it is permanently stationed. Under its own power—up to 5 knots—it would not have returned before 29 June, and therefore the decision was made to tow it, which allowed for a two-fold reduction in time. At 1400, after additional reviews of the mooring are conducted, the submarine was to be taken to the pier.

A search and rescue post was set up at the fleet command post, and it has been working intensively. It includes the most experienced specialists of the Search and Rescue Service.

With the arrival of the submarine, Admiral F. Gromov, commander of the Northern Fleet, and Vice Admiral S. Vargin, chief of the Political Directorate and member of the Military Council of the fleet, made a visit to the base. Measures for restoring the technical readiness of the ship have been planned.

Causes of Accident Viewed

PM0507135589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 89 p 2

[Article by Captain 1st Rank of the Reserve I. Kolton, candidate of technical sciences and senior scientific associate of the Nuclear Power Institute named for I.V. Kurchatov: "In the Silence of the Deep"—first eight paragraphs are a boxed "Viewpoint" introduction by V. Yunisov]

[Text] A Soviet nuclear-powered submarine recently arrived in one of the Norther Fleet's bases, having been "hit" in peacetime.

Nobody fired at it. Nobody shot torpedoes at it. It was forced to surface in the Norwegian Sea as a result of technical malfunction. By pure coincidence, this happened at the selfsame spot—off the "jinxed" Bear Island—where the submarine "Komsomolets" and 42 seamen were lost last April.

Fortunately, there were no casualties this time. There were no bitter tears shed by relatives and friends.

There were no funeral orchestras or flags flying at half-mast.

There were no last salute salvos.

There were no wreaths cast upon the waves. We would like to believe that the familiar salvage ship "Karabakh" will tow away the submarine promptly and without incident, and the latest commission will analyze the causes of the accident. It is up to the commission now. Maybe this commission will be the one to openly admit that ships start sinking not at sea but on shore. Maybe, following this incident, we will be finally told that, given its condition (both technical and everyday life), the Navy is primarily a threat to our own selves.

Today we publish an article by Ilya Borisovich Kolton, a highly skilled specialist who, from his own experience as a submariner, knows why accidents at sea have become so frequent.

We also publish a photograph taken in 1962 and showing N. Khrushchev presenting the Order of Lenin to I. Kolton, a young officer at the time. The submariner earned this distinction for his display of courage during a cruise mission. Now, 27 years later, he has displayed courage by writing a truthful article about the state of affairs in the nuclear-powered submarine fleet. [end Yunisov introduction]

I am a seaman who has devoted 30 years to the nuclear-powered fleet. And no matter how painful it may be to "wash dirty linen in public," life demands that the entire bitter truth be told. For the sake of seamen's lives and the Navy's future.

The state commission investigating the "Komsomolets" disaster is trying to discover the prime cause of the boat's loss in the burned seventh section. I think that this is a restricted view which will be of hardly any help in establishing common features in the loss of several units of our submarine fleet. Nobody today would be bold enough to point out the specific causes of the fire which broke out in the submarine's stern section—that is what the State Commission declared in the article "Tragedy and Courage," published by PRAVDA on 15 April 1989. But is there actually any need to identify the specific cause of the fire, especially since it is hardly possible to pinpoint it in the burned section?

And even if the submarine had actually been fated to perish as a result of any one of five causes or any combination of them, why did submariners have to die overboard? After all, they had at their disposal a VSK [vsplyvayushchaya spasatelnaya kamera] dry rescue chamber. It is designed to rescue the entire crew at maximum depth. The answer is simple. The Navy's Permanent Commission for the State Acceptance of Ships, when agreeing on the tests program and despite the industry's resistance, had insisted on realistic tests of the VSK at maximum depth, with a list factor and with a load equivalent to the weight of a full crew. The Navy's State Acceptance justified its demand by the fact that no such tests, not even on a model, had been carried out at any of the previous stages of the VSK's development [sozdaniye]. As bad luck would have it, the VSK had to be "tested" in realistic conditions. The outcome was lamentable: Only one out of five submariners was rescued in it, and that was by miracle.

Had an attempt been made to conduct full-scale realistic tests of the VSK, as demanded by the Navy's Permanent Commission for the State Acceptance of Ships, it would inevitably have brought to light a design fault preventing the crew from moving out of an accident-struck (sinking) submarine and into the VSK.

Experience has shown that, whenever calamity strikes the Navy, the commissions—protecting the top echelons of leadership—cover up the main culprits and, with them, the main causes of all calamities. A more sophisticated analysis of accidents and disasters would show that as a rule they follow a pattern and are similar because their persistent real causes are—together with the "cushy jobs"—part of the flesh and blood of top bosses.

Back in 1962, I was on a cruise mission to the North Pole as part of the crew of the submarine "Leninskiy Komsomol." The steam generators, which were unreliable at the time, had completed two-thirds of their service life but their design made no provision for reliably shutting down an accident-struck (leaking) generator. Specialists would understand the danger this presents. Extreme danger.

Emergency work was done just before we surfaced at the North Pole—at the crew's request (!)—to install shut-off valves on the steam generator to prevent the escape of radioactive water from the steam loop into the accommodation sections. It was established, however, that the valves were not hermetically sealed and would not serve their purpose if need arose. The mission to the North Pole was cancelled, and we returned as heroes. The entire crew was awarded orders and medals, while Flotilla Commander Rear Admiral A. Peterlin, Ship Commander Captain 2d Rank L. Zhiltsov, and Captain 2d Rank R. Timofeyev, commander of the No 5 Command Department [BCh-5] were awarded the title Hero of the Soviet Union.

Yes, the awards were deserved and all submariners know their price. Just as they know that they were given by way of payment for the serious design faults which jeopardized the ship and its crew.

A cruise mission on a nuclear-powered submarine provides a second memorable incident in my life. As a matter of fact, it was ready to be delivered for repairs by the manufacturer—the service life of the main equipment had expired, some instruments were faulty, the insulation of some electrical apparatus was below standard. But the command made an arbitrary decision to send the boat to sea. In order to correct all technical

shortcomings. I was recalled from leave and presented with the facts. I tried to object, since I knew perfectly well the state of technical readiness of boats, including this one.

I was then accused of cowardice and was warned that someone else could just as easily be sent on the cruise while the question of my further stay on duty was being decided. Following such pressure, I of course made the only correct decision in the circumstances: to sail, not because I was afraid of losing a cushy job but because I knew: My seamen would find it easier and safer with me.

All officers and seamen, regardless of their specialized training, were kept busy from the first day of that mission to the last: Radio operators worked as welders, sonar operators wielded wrenches, navigators ground spare parts on lathes, and everyone on the ship did as much as he could in order to survive.

My third and most memorable mission concerned the movement of a nuclear-powered submarine from its base to the manufacturer for repairs. The submarine had been prepared to be towed to the repairs site. Because the reactors' fuel cores had reached danger limits, there was a ban on operating the main power installation.

Things were calm, no emergencies were anticipated. Suddenly, just 24 hours before setting off, we received orders from the command to travel to the repairs site using our own main power installation. And we, conditioned to unquestioning obedience, obeyed the order. Our sole consolation was that the cruise would not last long.

But circumstances changed sharply while we were at sea: We had been listed to participate in fleet exercises! Instead of several hours as planned, our mission lasted 6 days and nights.

Best never to remember those days!..

Practice is the criterion of truth, and I would make so bold as to formulate the common and genuine causes of all accidents and disasters.

And so, design faults plus inadequate crew rescue facilities (of which KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA has already written), plus astounding sluggishness and inertia by the naval department when it comes to the introduction of fresh ideas—that, in my view, is the alarming formula of the recent emergencies and tragedies.

Investigation Begins

PM0407113989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Captain 1st Class Yu. Magakov, temporary acting chief of the Northern Fleet Technical Directorate, by Captain 3d Class P. Ishchenko, "our permanent correspondent" in the Northern Fleet: "After Accident"; date of interview not stated]

[Text] After the return to base of the nuclear submarine with the damaged reactor the reasons for the incident have begun to be studied. Captain 3d Class P. Ishchenko, our permanent correspondent in the Northern Fleet, met with Captain 1st Class Yu. Magakov, temporary acting chief of the fleet's technical directorate. He said:

[Magakov] The technical commission for investigating the causes of the accident headed by Vice Admiral V. Zaytsev, deputy commander in chief of the Navy for maintenance and repairs, has set to work. Of course, it is still too early to draw definitive conclusions. Everything will become more or less clear in about 10 days time when the parameters of the reactor's fuel core will return to normal. What I have in mind primarily is the temperature, which is steadily dropping as a result of the measures which are being taken. It is now 70-75 degrees.

[Ishchenko] What work is now being done on the submarine?

[Magakov] Immediately after it arrived the deactivation of the reactor compartment began. Then special transport designed to take on and process liquid and solid radioactive waste approached the submarine. The water used to cool the reactor is being transferred to it from the nuclear submarine.

[Ishchenko] In your opinion, what role was played in the incident by the age of this submarine, which is after all already over 25 years old?

[Magakov] The submarine set sail in good technical repair. In 1985 it underwent a medium repair and last year the fuel cores of both reactors on it were reloaded.

[Ishchenko] In that case is it expedient to continue to use such old ships? After all, they are a constant source of danger to people.

[Magakov] We are performing work to determine the suitability of old ships for further use. Thus, the old ships of one project were recently taken out of commission. The necessary documents are now being prepared on the technical state of all ships of the project which includes the damaged submarine. Proposals will probably be made as to the expediency of their further operation.

Investigation Completed

LD0507175589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Correspondent V. Anuchin interview with A.I. Shevchenko, rear-admiral, squadron commander, from the "Vremya" newscast; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] The state commission has completed work aboard the nuclear submarine of the Northern Fleet, on which there was an accident in the Norwegian Sea.

[Begin recording] [correspondent V. Anuchin] The nuclear submarine is currently moored at the base. A strict dosimetric check is carried out on it every day.

Radiation measuring apparatus units have been erected. Specialists are cooling the main power installation on the vessel. The measures for cooling and cleaning the reactor present no danger to the environment, for the water is pumped from our special tank.

[A.I. Shevchenko, rear-admiral, squadron commander] We are not causing any harmful effects to the ecology, to the atmosphere, or to the marine environment, because all the measures carried out by aviation and chemical reconnaisance vessels in the bay are not exposed. Therefore the personnel is in a position of complete safety, and even the very fact that you are now standing at this mooring station illustrates that it is absolutely safe for people here.

[Anuchin] What was revealed by the state commission after its work here on the vessel?

[Shevchenko] The state commission found that the ship's personnel acted correctly and carried out the whole technological sequence of operations in the event of an accident.

[Anuchin] But the vessel is over 20 years old; In principle, it is already outdated, morally speaking.

[Shevchenko] If you examine this particular accident—there has never been such an accident in the navy before—as far as the term of service of vessels of over 20 years is concerned, it undoubtedly leads to certain conclusions that equipment, after working in extreme conditions over a period of many years, also becomes obsolete. This accident then, should now be a lesson to us. We must also change our attitude toward these ships.

[Anuchin] As soon as the nuclear submarine returned to base, the crew was sent to the hospital of the Northern Fleet for examination. The doctors found that their condition was satisfactory and that no one had been affected by radiation. The crew went back to its duties today. [video shows submarine at moorings: man with dosimetric apparatus checking radiation levels; men working in control room; interview with officer] [end recording]

Officer Describes 1972 Submarine Disaster

18010722 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
22 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by V. Zavarin: "Of Courage, Exploits, and Fame"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted]

Tragedy Under Water

In the past, I was a submarine officer. I would like to describe one of the unknown chapters of history of our Navy, which recorded courage under tragic circumstances.

In 1972, our submarine was returning from an independent cruise. Viktor Pavlovich Kulibaba was our commander. Among our officers, we had Boris Aleksandrovich Polyakov, a very experienced submariner-engineer, operator at the control console of the main propulsion plant. I believe that all surviving members of the crew owe their lives to him. Our doctor, Misha Piskunov, also was on this mission. He also had to play a decisive role in saving our comrades, as well as the officer of the division headquarters Viktor Mikhaylovich Nechayev. I personally owe my life to Nechayev.

This is what happened. At a very great depth, half an hour before surfacing, an accident occurred. A flame under high pressure ripped through the 9th compartment where the crew quarters were located. The duty seaman managed to alert the people and report to the control room... The compartment petty officer Vasilyev was found half-burned close to the point of origin of the fire as late as several weeks later.

The flame turned into a generator of hot carbon monoxide. Our submarine was more than 10 years old by then, and the notion of airtight compartments was purely nominal. The submarine was in need of an overhaul. However, the top brass apparently needed to report to those at the very top that yet another combat unit was performing combat duty.

Captain Lieutenant Lev Grigoryevich Tsygankov remained at his battle station in the 8th compartment. He is buried in Sevastopol. The young Lieutenant Khrychikov did not abandon the control console of the propulsion plant. Warrant Officer Nikolayenko remained at his battle station. Machinist mates also died at the steering gear. Indeed, we lost many of our comrades then.

The 10th compartment turned out to be cut off from everything. When the damage-control alarm was called, I called the 10th compartment on the phone. Torpedoman Ivan Khramtsov was there. He reported that their bulkhead was getting hot, and the paint was smoking.

We extricated the people from the propulsion plant compartments and passed them on up. It is very difficult to drag an unconscious person through several compartments of a submarine. Doctor Piskunov showed us how to do "mouth-to-mouth" resuscitation. He managed to bring back to life almost all of them. We only failed to bring around two men. These guys were buried according to maritime customs.

We surfaced. However, this was not the end of the ordeal. Only a submariner can visualize what it is to be in a submarine without power on the surface during a furious storm..

In the 10th compartment, 12 persons were still suffocating in the fumes of burning paint and carbon monoxide. Several hours later, I talked on the phone to chief petty officer of the chemical service team Warrant Officer Valeriy Borshchov. I did not think the guys were going to live. The oxygen supply in their individual breathing equipment was running out. Several men were unconscious. The 9th compartment was on fire, the 8th was on fire, the 7th had gas in it, and the temperature there went over 100 degrees; the 6th compartment also had gas in it. The 5th was flooded, and lost sealing. Any attempt to get to the control room from the 10th compartment was fraught with death. It was a miracle that communications remained, thanks to a huge bilateral communications telephone. We had a laugh about these phones—a miracle model 1916 at a nuclear-powered vessel. However, this "miracle" worked, apart from the telephone station and power supply. The magneto handle had to be turned in order to raise the other party.

For 3 weeks, the submarine was tossed about as a shell, and 12 persons on emergency rations clung to hope where it was pitch dark and cold.

They were in confinement for 23 days—the officer Boris Polyakov and 11 men with him. The accident occurred on 24 February, but we were only able to get the guys out on 18 March. We brought them out blindfolded, holding them by the hands, some were taken out on stretchers... Still, they survived!

When I tried to write about those who had died and about the accident I was turned away at various editorial offices—they said it was not typical. But this did happen indeed! I believe that we should not hide from each other difficult chapters of our history. The latter will not be complete without them. Heroes should be not for posterity, but also for our contemporaries.